










*J. B. Hardy*



*J. E. Wallaw*



A  
FIVE DAYS DEBATE

BETWEEN

ELDER JAMES B. HARDY,

OF THE

REGULAR BAPTISTS,


AND

REV. ISHAM E. WALLACE,

OF THE

MISSIONARY BAPTISTS,

UPON CHURCH IDENTITY.



*"If the truth make you free, ye shall be free indeed."*

---

G. BEEBE & SON, PRINTERS, MIDDLETOWN, ORANGE CO., N. Y.  
1881.

BX6331  
H35  
COPY. 2

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1880, by

JAMES B. HARDY,

In the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington.

## P R E F A C E .

IT IS a well-known fact that there are two bodies of Baptists in this country, one known by the appellation of Old School, or Regular, and the other styled the United, or Missionary Baptists, both claiming to be the legal descendants of the Apostles; and since the contention has of late become of considerable moment, it was agreed between the two contending parties that they should meet in discussion, and that a truthful report of it should be made and published. Accordingly, the Missionaries made choice of REV. I. E. WALLACE, of Marshall County, Kentucky, and ELD. JAS. B. HARDY, of Crittenden County, Kentucky, was selected to represent the Regular Baptists. The Debatants met at Mount Moriah Church, in Marshall County, Kentucky, on Monday, July 26th, 1880, and the following pages contain an account of what there took place.

## INTRODUCTION.

ELDER Fulkerson, of Illinois, called the meeting to order and stated briefly the object of the proposed debate.

Moderators having been chosen, Rev. Mr. Wallace said :

"I would say to the brethren that I am indorsed by my Association. My brethren indorse me anywhere, and I presume that will be satisfactory. I will now state the proposition to be discussed :

"The Regular Baptists are the church of Christ, and have come down by regular succession from the days of the Apostles to the present time, and do now maintain the doctrine and practice of the ancient Baptists.

"Of this proposition Elder Hardy affirms and I deny."

The rules governing the debate were then read, and prayer offered.

MOUNT MORIAH, Ky., July 26, 1880.

# THE DEBATE.

ELDER HARDY SAID:

GENTLEMEN Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: The object of our meeting here to-day is to discuss the important question that you have heard stated; and in opening the discussion I wish to say that I only hope to vindicate the truth as it is in Jesus Christ. In the first place, I want to speak of the setting up of the church of the Lord Jesus Christ upon earth; after which I will speak of the relation of that kingdom to the doctrine and the sentiments which the people termed Regular Baptists profess to believe. I shall set up the truth as we profess to believe it, and our system, of which we are not ashamed; and I shall then trace that people from the days of the Apostles down to the present time, as having always believed the same thing.

I shall first read from Daniel ii. 44: "And in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom which shall never be destroyed: and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, but it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand forever." Let me remark here that this quotation itself is enough to prove that the organization which Christ set up has stood from that time to this, because he says "it shall stand forever." And we find in the same chapter we make this quotation from, that there

were four kingdoms brought to view, and all these kingdoms were earthly kingdoms, except the one kingdom that Christ set up, of which he says, "In the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom which shall never be destroyed." And I take the position here that these earthly kingdoms did continue until Christ's kingdom was set up on earth.

I will refer you next to Matthew xvi. 18: "And I say unto thee that thou art Peter; and upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." This is the Savior himself speaking, it will be remembered, and he says, "Upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." Now let me ask the question right here, Is Jesus going to build his church by his own power, or is it to be done by some other power? We take it for granted that this saying of Jesus is the truth when he says, "Upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it."

I will next call your attention to John xviii. 36: "Jesus answered, My kingdom is not of this world: if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews: but now is my kingdom not from hence." Now, mark the expression, "My kingdom is not of this world." Consequently we take the position that this kingdom which Jesus set up is not of this world, and that the material which composes this church, Jesus says, is not of this world. Therefore he says, "I have chosen you out of the world." I take the position that this church which Christ set up is not of the world; and if there is a kingdom set up by the intervention of man, I tell you it is not the church of the Lord Jesus Christ. He said that his church is not of the

world; and consequently it does not take the wealth of the world to support it; and where a church is set up and supported by the wealth of the world, it is not the church of the Lord Jesus Christ.

Again, I will refer you to Luke i. 44: "And he shall reign over the house of Jacob forever, and of his kingdom there shall be no end." Also Luke xii. 32, where he speaks of the characteristics that will compose this church which he says he is going to build up. "Fear not, little flock, for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom." This brings to view the kingdom that he refers to. Jesus says, in speaking to his church, "Fear not, little flock." You will probably hear at the outset, as an argument, on the other side of this debate, that their church is of great numbers, and that, consequently, they are certainly right in their doctrines, and I read this quotation simply to show you that Christ in speaking to his people said to them, "Fear not, little flock."

In Isaiah ix. 6, we are shown the character we profess to worship. "For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given, and the government shall be upon his shoulder; and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The Mighty God, The Everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace." This is the Lord Jesus Christ that we profess to worship. He is often called "Wonderful," and will always be, for his kingdom shall stand forever.

Now I will refer you, in this same line of illustration, to James i. 17: "Every good gift and every perfect gift is from above, and cometh down from the Father of lights, with whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning." He is an unchangeable God, and this is the character we worship. Also see Isaiah xli. 9, 10: "Remember the former things of old;

for I am God, and there is none else; I am God, and there is none like me, declaring the end from the beginning, and from ancient times the things that are not yet done, saying, My counsel shall stand, and I will do all my pleasure." And that is the kind of God we worship; a God that changes not; that says his counsel shall stand, and that he will do all his pleasure. Then, I take the position that the Lord Jesus Christ will perform all his work without any assistance from those of the world.

Again, I refer you to Isaiah xl. 10, which may be read at leisure, and which time will not now allow me to turn to.

So we have now set forth the kingdom that it is the purpose of the Lord to set up, and I have told you something in regard to the character of the God that we profess to worship—a great and supreme Ruler over this kingdom that has been brought to view. Now I wish to remark here, that we as a people believe in the doctrine of Election, the doctrine of Predestination, and so on. I am going to take that position here, and I do not want to depart from the principles that the Regular Baptists profess. We profess to stand on the doctrine of Election. I take the position here that the Bible teaches eternal and unconditional election; that it is personal, eternal, and unconditional. Now, have the Baptists as a people believed that from the days of the Apostles down to the present time? And that is the question here. I say distinctly that they have. Referring to Deuteronomy xxxii. 9, we find that it is said, "For the Lord's portion is his people; Jacob is the lot of his inheritance." Also, referring to 1st Samuel xii. 22, he says, "For the Lord will not forsake his people for his great name's sake: because it hath pleased the Lord to make you his people." Now let me tell you here, that

if you are of the people of God to-day, it is not due to your own efforts, but it is because God hath chosen you; else why are you called the people of God? "Because it hath pleased the Lord to make you his people." I say it is not because you make yourself so; it is not because you have done something in that great work of yourself; but you are so because it hath pleased God to make you so. That is the reason why. Again, in Psalm lxxv. 4, it is said, "Blessed is the man whom thou choosest, and causest to approach unto thee, that he may dwell in thy courts: we shall be satisfied with the goodness of thy house, even of thy holy temple." Now, here is a man whom God has chosen, and the Bible says that he is blessed; blessed is the man that is the choice of God. That is the character that he has chosen. God gives him the power to approach him; and when you see people approaching the Lord Jesus Christ you may take it for granted they do so by the power of the grace of God, and not by any power of their own. I refer you now to Deuteronomy vii. 6: "For thou art a holy people unto the Lord thy God: the Lord thy God hath chosen thee to be a special people unto himself, above all people that are upon the face of the earth." (7) "The Lord did not set his love upon you, nor choose you, because ye were more in number than any people; for ye were the fewest of all people." So it seems the Lord did not set his love upon you, nor choose you, because you are more than any other people, but because you are the fewest of people. Then, again, see Isaiah xlv. 4: "For Jacob my servant's sake, and Israel mine elect, I have even called thee by thy name. I have surnamed thee, though thou hast not known me." Also, again in Isaiah, lxxv. 9: "And I will bring forth a seed out of Jacob, and out of Judah an inheritor of my mountains; and

mine elect shall inherit it, and my servants shall dwell there." Again, Ephesians i. 2-4: "Grace be to you, and peace, from God our Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ." (3) "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ," (4) "According as he hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before him in love." Does that mean that we were chosen in Christ "before the foundation of the world," or that he chose us when we approached him? It says here positively, "According as he hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world," speaking of those who had been blessed by the Lord Jesus Christ "with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ." Then, again, in 1st Peter i. 1: "Peter, an Apostle of Jesus Christ, to the strangers scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia and Bithynia," (2) "Elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ: grace unto you, and peace, be multiplied." Now here it is spoken of again as the elect of God, and of that passage there can be no doubt. Then see 2d Timothy ii. 10: "Therefore I endure all things for the elect's sake, that they may also obtain the salvation which is in Christ Jesus with eternal glory."

I think I have now produced enough testimony on the subject of the doctrine of Election to prove to you that God chose his people "before the foundation of the world." I want now to speak in regard to the atonement, and I am going to take the position that the atonement that Christ made did not extend to the entire race of men, but that that atonement was limited; that the atonement that Christ made was

made for his people, and it did not extend to any other race of men; and in support of that position I will quote first from Isaiah lii. 3: "For thus saith the Lord, Ye have sold yourselves for naught, and ye shall be redeemed without money." Here is the positive statement made in the scriptures, that redemption shall be made without price; and it is very clear that the matter of redemption is not left with us, as to whether we will be redeemed. But the positive declaration is made that we have sold ourselves "for naught," and that we "shall be redeemed without money." But these Missionaries tell us now that it requires money, that money must be had for the purposes of redemption. All that is necessary is for them to refer to that passage, and several others that I shall quote. Isaiah liii. 5-8: (5) "But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed." (6) "All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way; and the Lord hath laid on him the iniquities of us all." (7) "He was oppressed, and he was afflicted, yet he opened not his mouth: he is brought as a lamb to the slaughter, and as a sheep before her shearers is dumb, so he openeth not his mouth." (8) "He was taken from prison and from judgment: and who shall declare his generation? for he was cut off out of the land of the living: for the transgression of my people was he stricken." That is what Isaiah says about it, and I am disposed to believe it. It was for the transgressions of the people of God. Now I refer you to Luke i. 68: "Blessed be the Lord God of Israel; for he hath visited and redeemed his people." From that I take the position that the work is done, because the Bible says that he has "visited and re-

deemed his people." I refer you then to Romans v. 8-10: (8) "But God commendeth his love towards us, in that while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us." (9) "Much more then, being now justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him." (10) "For if when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son; much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life." Again, I refer you to Revelation v. 9: "And they sung a new song, saying, Thou art worthy to take the book, and open the seals thereof; for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation." Now if this is an atonement that will extend to the entire race of men, where was the necessity for such an expression as we find in this text? Why does he not say that he *will* redeem every nation, kindred and people, in place of saying that he *has* redeemed every nation, kindred and tongue? It does not say that he will redeem the balance of us by our own labors, but it says positively that he has "redeemed us to God." John x. 15, 16: (15) "As the Father knoweth me, even so know I the Father; and I lay down my life for the sheep." Now mark the expression: "I lay down my life for the sheep." Positively "for the sheep." (16) "And other sheep I have which are not of this fold: them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice; and there shall be one fold, and one Shepherd." It says distinctly, "they *shall*." It seems to me, however, that I have produced enough testimony on this portion of the subject to convince all candid minds, and I shall now pass on to other points.

I shall now say a little on the subject of salvation. I take the position of the Regular Baptists on this subject here to-day; and if it is not their doctrine as I expound it, I want

them to say so. I stand here representing the Regular Baptists, and I propose to set forth the doctrine that they profess and believe. And I take the position first on this subject, that the eternal salvation of the sinner is unconditional upon the part of the sinner in every sense of the word, from beginning to end; and if I do not prove that assertion by the Bible, and if my brother can get up here and show that salvation is conditional, and dependent upon a certain work to be performed by the sinner, I want him to prove it by the Bible alone, which I am confident he cannot do. In the first place I will turn to Matthew i. 21, and I wish this congregation to observe strictly and carry in their minds the line of proof I shall adduce in support of my position.

“And she shall bring forth a son, and thou shalt call his name Jesus: for he shall save his people from their sins.”

It would seem from that passage very clear that the Lord Jesus Christ had a people in the world that were not saved. I presume that will not be disputed. You are bound to take the position that this quotation from the scripture does prove conclusively that the Lord had a distinct people that belonged to him, or you are bound to take the position that all the race of man belongs to him. “He shall save his people” are the words, and it is clear a distinct people was meant, and that their salvation was to be entirely unconditional.

Then I refer you to Luke xix. 10: “For the Son of man is come to seek and to save that which was lost.” What did he come to do? Does this passage show that the Lord Jesus Christ came merely to save those that seek him? Does the text I have quoted say so? No; but it says he came “to seek and to save that which was lost.” Let me tell you that

according to the testimony of Luke the *seeking* was done by the Lord Jesus Christ, as the *saving* was done. He came to seek and to save, and he will in his own good time do both.

Again, in 1st Timothy i. 15; "This is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptation, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners." Now if he came into the world to save sinners, I want to know whether he did it. I want my brother who is on the other side of this debate to be very particular when he comes to speak to answer upon this point. The testimony of the Bible is that "Jesus came into the world to save sinners." That is the testimony of Paul. Now if Christ came into the world to save sinners, did he do it? If he did not do it, I want to know why he didn't do it; and if he did do it, I want my opponent here to tell me what is the use of the Missionary Baptists. Why do they claim that they can aid in the saving of sinners, when the Bible says distinctly that Jesus came into the world to do that very thing?

Again, I refer you to 2d Timothy i. 9, 10: "Who hath saved us, and called us with an holy calling; not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began," (10) "But is now made manifest by the appearing of our Savior Jesus Christ, who hath abolished death, and brought life and immortality to light through the gospel."

Ephesians ii. 8, 9: "For by grace are ye saved, through faith, and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God." (9) "Not of works, lest any man should boast."

Now, can any person, in the face of this statement that I have quoted, take the position that salvation is in any sense a work to be accomplished by the sinner? I think this pas-

sage alone ought to substantiate my position. But I will quote from Matthew xi. 27: "No man knoweth the Son, but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him." I take the position, as shown by that quotation, that the knowledge of God is revealed, and that we cannot know him otherwise; it is alone by revelation.

John v. 21: "For as the Father raiseth up the dead and quickeneth them, even so the Son quickeneth whom he will." I say we see from this, too, that it is not dependent upon the man. It does not say, I will quicken you if you will let me, but it says that he "quickeneth whom he will;" and that is the kind of a God that we worship. If it is the will of God, he will quicken every individual in this house now, according to the testimony that is brought to view here; and let me tell you, all the powers of antichrist and all the powers of hell cannot prevent him from doing his work that he purposed doing in all eternity.

Jude 1: "Jude, the servant of Jesus Christ, and brother of James, to them that are sanctified by God the Father, and preserved in Jesus Christ, and called." Mark the expression, "Sanctified by God the Father." There the character of God in this light is brought to view again. "Sanctified by God the Father, and preserved in Jesus Christ," and the Bible says, "and called." The characters that are shown here are "called," "sanctified by God the Father," and "preserved in Jesus Christ." These are the characters that are brought to view here as being called by God.

1st John v. 10, 11: "He that believeth on the Son of God hath the witness in himself;" which proves that we cannot believe on the Son of God without the witness being in our-

selves. "He that believeth not God, hath made him a liar; because he believeth not the record that God gave of his Son." Let me call your attention here for a moment to this phrase, "He that believeth not God, hath made him a liar." Why? Simply from the fact that he "believeth not the record that God gave of his Son." Now, what is that record? Let me tell you what that record is. "And this is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son." Now let us see if we cannot prove our position. I want to know if this grace that is revealed to us and that quickens us into life is the gift of God, or whether it is accomplished by man. "He that believeth not God, hath made him a liar; because he believeth not the record that God gave of his Son. And this is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life." It is a gift of God from the first to the last; and let me tell you, if we have to work for it, it is not and cannot be a gift. No; I tell you that salvation is by the grace of God, and without any labor on the part of the sinner. It is not had by anything that we do or can do, and if you take the position that it can be done by the sinner himself, you then make God a liar, because he has said, "Because he believeth not the record that God gave of his Son. And this is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son." He has given it; it is a gift. That is our doctrine. It is charged, however, that the doctrine I have advanced does not give a chance to all. Very well. I want to know from my brother on the other side if he does not believe that a portion of the race of man sinks down to eternal destruction. If God has made salvation conditional and dependent upon certain work to be performed by the sinner, and the sinner fails to perform that work and goes to hell, I

want to know if Jesus Christ did as much for that sinner that goes to hell as for the sinner that goes to heaven. If Jesus Christ did as much for the sinner that goes to hell as he who goes to heaven, I want to know if it is the act of the creature or the gift of God. I want to know if salvation is conditional. I want to know if my brother is going to agree with me in the position that I have set up. If he does not agree with me, I want him to take up the quotations I have made and answer them before this people and say to them that these words do mean what I have said they mean. If salvation is conditional, I want him to tell you how. If election is conditional, and depends upon something to be done upon our part, I want him to tell you so, and I want him to prove it by the Bible; for it is truth alone that I am after, and not victory. If I am in error I want to get out of it before this discussion closes. I want to tell this people to-day that I believe I stand on the right platform, and that is where I propose to stand from first to last until I am convinced that I am wrong.

A question will come up as to our preachers not being paid. Let me say in regard to that, I believe the Apostles when they sent assistance to the brethren in other parts thought it was right, and when we send our brethren to other parts to-day in the same way, it is equally right; but no doubt brother Wallace will tell you that the Old Baptists did not do that; that they never paid a dollar to send the gospel anywhere. As to that, I wish to make a remark here and give an illustration. Brother Fulkerson, of Illinois, who is present here to-day, I saw a short time ago was sent to Kansas, as I understand, for the purpose of helping to organize a church

there, and I am informed the brethren in Illinois pay his expenses, which amount to, I believe, fifty dollars. But though we do that thing, we do not have hired missionaries for the purpose of going all over the country. I know that none of their missionaries preach more than I do. I reckon there are none of them that ride more in one year than I do in preaching the gospel. I have traveled thousands of miles every year in the effort to spread the truth and proclaim it; but though I and others do the same thing, we do not do it through any missionary board. We do not have anything of that kind, because there is nothing of it in the Bible, and we are governed by the Bible. We take the Bible alone for our rule and practice. And that is where we stand to-day. I will show that this has been the rule and practice that has governed our people from the days of the Apostles down to the present time. The question is asked, "How far back do you go?" I say now that I propose to trace them from the days of the Apostles down to this time—the people that are now called the Regular Baptists. Brother Wallace cannot trace his people, nor the doctrines that he sets up, from that time. We take the position to-day that we stand right where the Baptists have always stood, and I think I have produced testimony enough in my opening speech of that position. I have spoken of the doctrine of Election, of the doctrine of the Atonement, and of the doctrine of Salvation, and if he can overturn the scriptural quotations I have produced here to-day, and if he can prove to this people that what the Bible says—that it is by grace alone and is the gift of God, and not the work of the sinner—if he can prove that by the Bible, I will be very much surprised. Peter says that we believe that through the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ we shall be saved,

and that is where we stand to-day. We have never deviated from that old landmark. We have never deviated from the primitive mode of preaching and practice. The Baptists did that in the dark ages, and they were put to death for it. Were they then the 'popular denomination?' Are they the popular denomination to-day? If the Missionary Baptists stand on the platform that the Apostles of old did, and who were persecuted for their belief, why is it that they have become so popular now? How does that come about? The Bible says, "Woe unto you when all men speak well of you." The world cannot live in the truth until it is born of the Spirit of God. Let me tell you that the doctrine which we profess is the doctrine that the devotees of have ever been persecuted for. The finger of scorn has ever been pointed at them; and I tell you now, before God, that that will ever be the case. I say that according to the testimony of the Bible it will be the case always that the people of God set up as the church in our Lord Jesus Christ will ever be persecuted, as long as they stand. The kingdom that Christ set up was not of the world, and it does not, as I remarked before, require the wealth of the world to support it. It never has, and it never will; for Jesus Christ has said, "Upon this rock I will build my church." It is built; and it does seem to me that when people want to know where that kingdom is they should not look for it in structures that are reared up by the inventions of men; they should not look for something that is kept up by money and machinery, or anything of that sort; but they should look to the kingdom that grew by the power of the Lord Jesus Christ. For he says positively, "Upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." They have tried it, but they have

never succeeded. Away back in the dark ages they thought it would be extinguished; but when we look around we see that when they were despised and oppressed, they sprang up in other places and preached this doctrine of salvation by grace; and let me tell you that is the doctrine of the Baptists to-day, and has ever been their doctrine from the days of the Apostles down to the present time. They have never preached anything else; and I say to you that everything outside of that doctrine is false. The truth as it is in the Lord Jesus Christ has ever been persecuted. There has never been a time, according to the history of the world, when the church of the Lord Jesus Christ has not been persecuted; and, brethren, I do honestly believe that if the time was to roll around when the world would fall in love with our system, and when the world would begin to speak in our favor, my impression is that we would cease to be the church of Christ; for the Bible says, "Woe unto you when all men shall speak well of you." In the history of the world false prophets were always thought well of; but the people of the true church were always persecuted. There were, it is said, eight hundred and fifty false prophets where there was one true one.

Now, brethren, what I say is to be published, for I want the people to know where I stand when I am dead and gone. I want them to know that it is all by grace from first to last, and I want them to know that we are saved only by the grace of God. Where is the character that is born of the Spirit of God that can come up before me to-day and say that it is not all by grace? I take the position here, before God, that salvation by grace, and by grace alone, is the only system that has ever been preached in the world that is sufficient to reach the case of the human family in every condi-

tion. It is God's plan, and his plan never fails; but if we set up a system of our own, though we may succeed in making a big show, I tell you it will soon all become extinguished. If salvation is to be had by works, and if it is left to the volition of the sinner, I want brother Wallace to tell you the duties of the sinner.

It is well known to this people that the Missionary Baptists believe and teach the doctrine of free agency. When brother Wallace follows me, I want him to tell you if the doctrine of free agency does not make the man the cause of his own salvation. I want him, if he takes the position that a man is a free agent, to explain to this people what a free agent is, in plain terms, so that we can all understand it. If we take the position that salvation is conditional, then we come across a people that cannot comply with the conditions. But when we take the position that salvation is alone by grace, here is God's plan; and let me tell you it can reach big and little. It applies to every condition a man may be in that has ever been placed in the world. It can reach the case of the blind; it can reach the dumb; it can reach the case of the deaf; and let me tell you here, that is the kind of a God that we preach to-day. I believe that the people of God to-day feel dependent on God, and my dependence on him compelled me to this discussion. I speak so certainly, because I am so confident that I am standing on the truth as it is in the Lord Jesus Christ; for if the Regular Baptists are wrong to-day, the Baptists have been wrong for eighteen hundred years. I defy my brother to show a people that has come up by regular succession from the days of the Apostles to the present time that has believed a doctrine in opposition to this that the Regular Baptists believe to-day.

[The Moderator announced that the speaker's time was up.]

REV. MR. WALLACE SAID:

GENTLEMEN Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: I am before you this morning to commence a series of lectures on the principles you have heard read. My brother says he can show a people coming from the days of the Apostles. So can I. He cannot show, however, that his is the people. Now, mark that. I know that he can show that there is a people that came up from that time, but when he says that his is that people, I deny it; and all I ask of this people is that I may have your attention during the time that I will speak. I will show that his is not the people that he has spoken of, and I will prove it by works that he himself depends on. I will prove it by the Pedo works, men that are not directly interested in this discussion. I will prove it by the Pedobaptists themselves that he never had an existence prior to the year 1832, and I defy him to show anywhere that he had a separate existence prior to that year. I feel at the present time like Paul before Agrippa: I feel that I am here before my God to answer for my belief. I know that these Regular Baptists, as they call themselves, have preached all over the country that they excluded us from their church; but I will prove to you emphatically that these slanders that have been heaped on our people are absolutely without foundation. I propose before this discussion ends to forever put a quietus on that claim, that they excluded us from their church. And now, all you Baptists here who have been winking for brother Hardy, please wink a little while for me.

I will now submit to brother Hardy a series of questions that involve the difference between him and me, and I will give him two days and a half to answer them, and then I will assume the burden of proof. Now, mark what I tell you: it does not depend on me to prove these things until the two days and a half have expired, and at the end of that time I will assume the burden of proof on these points.

The first question I will ask brother Hardy is, Where did you have a separate denomination before the year 1832? How many Baptists were there in 1832, when the separation commenced? I will ask him to tell this people how many Baptists there were in the United States in the year 1840, when the separation ended. Also tell this people how many people you excluded from the church. Tell them how many you have now in the United States, and tell them how many you have in Europe. Who first brought the gospel from Europe to America? Tell this people what makes the difference between the people of America and the heathen nations.

I assure you now that brother Hardy will not answer one of these questions. Some of them he cannot answer, and some of them he will not answer, because they are directly opposed to his doctrine. I put these questions to Mr. Hardy once before when we had a discussion in Livingston County, and on that occasion he failed to answer one of them. And here is another question I will put to him: Did you ever send a missionary on any plan whatever? It is true that brother Hardy says that he did: that brother Fulkerson went over to Kansas somewhere, I reckon to feed the sheep. That is your doctrine, sheep feeders. But I will propound another query: Did you ever have a Theological School, or a Bible or Tract Society? and I will show you hereafter why I ask these

questions. Brother Hardy says I cannot go away back yonder to support my position. Well, we will see about that. I will show you the existence of Theological institutions before you ever had any existence at all. I will show you where there were Tract Societies a thousand years before your denomination had an existence. I will proceed with my questions. Where did you ever have an organized prayer meeting? Did you ever hold a protracted meeting? I propose to show from the Bible protracted meetings, and I will show from the same source missionary operations. I will also show a financial agent being used. Did you ever have a general association belonging to your order? Did you ever make articles of faith a test of fellowship in your denomination?

Then, what did he say next? "We believe in eternal election." Now eternal election means eternal children. Well, who denies that? Then he says, "An unchangeable God is the kind of a God we worship." I suppose the intimation is that the Missionary Baptists worship a changeable God. He says, "According to some people's" doctrine. Whose people does he mean? There are now one thousand denominations in the world. Brother Hardy should tell us what he means by "some people." There are Reformers here, and there are Presbyterians, and there are Methodists, and they don't know what you mean. Let brother Hardy just say "Wallace's people," and I will answer him. I am here to defend them and my system.

My brother sets up his position as to salvation, and intimates that the people whom I represent believe in salvation by works. Now if he will make that charge squarely before this people, I will go for him. Talk of your salvation by

grace! Why, our people believe that as much as anybody, and brother Hardy knows it. I tell you the prejudice of these people is so great that they will not do us justice; not because they are not good people, but simply their prejudices are so great that they will not do other denominations justice. Why, they tell people that they are the only people that preach the truth. Don't they preach that very thing all over the country?

Now I propose to prove that these very people have departed from the teachings of the Primitive Baptists, and I propose to prove it by their own authors. Here is Fain, who came through this country a few years ago and went from church to church. You know how these people have talked about missionaries and hired preachers. Mr. Hardy knows how I ran this thing on him in the previous discussion we had, and he will not forget it. Hear what Fain says on that point. Does it hinder gospel progress? No. Does it discourage sinners? He says no. Does it force them to hell? Again he says no. If a sinner is lost it is because he would not accept the truth. And that is the doctrine that we are preaching in this country. I will show you emphatically from this same author that this people have deviated from the principles and practices of the ancient Baptists. On page 84 of this same book the following passage occurs: "There is, strange to say, an error entertained by some brethren, that the minister of the Lord should not call on 'all men everywhere to repent,' on sinners to look to Christ and be saved, nor on unbelievers to believe. They are constantly saying, to preach in this way betrays Arminianism." And don't you all know how mortally afraid those people are of that? They make a bugbear of it everywhere that they preach. Then

this passage proceeds: "Observe, shall we become Arminians by faithfully preaching according to the commission given by the Savior? Some, indeed, seem to think so; for when the minister discharges his duty zealously, faithfully, and in a gospel manner, there are certain ones who cry out, He is an Arminian. The great error, that this is one of the varieties of Arminianism, is affecting both our pulpits and churches; for instead of requiring this kind of preaching, and sustaining it as a church, we fear some are opposed to it, and use their influence to suppress it." So you see here that Watson says it is affecting "our churches," and if you deny that, you have to renounce Watson. Then he goes on to say, "I ask now, in the name of this world-wide commission, including as it does every creature capable of hearing, and which authorizes and commands the ministerial servants of the Lord to preach the gospel to every creature, who does so? with that love, zeal and regard for the sinner, I subjoin to the question, which the Lord enjoins. Further, is it not to be feared that we have in this way grieved and silenced to some extent the spirit of exhortation in our pulpits?"

Now I want to know what the brother is to say in answer to that charge of Dr. Watson's. I know that you have done what he says, and I know that you know it. Now he says further: "Brethren, have we not deviated somewhat in this particular from the Apostolic mode of preaching?" I say you have, and very badly have you deviated, too. Watson proceeds: "If so, let us correct our errors by the word of God. Who is willing to attempt it? Who is ready to lead off in this great but neglected work, as 'examples' to more timid and fearful ones? Let those undertake it who are able to convince the gainsayers from the word of God that such

preaching was commanded by the Lord, and that the preaching of his servants, as long as we have a scriptural history of it, furnishes a practical example of this mode of preaching the gospel. A gospel without exhortation, without a call on the sinner to repent and believe, a gospel which does not in a word address itself to all, is not the gospel which Christ ordained." Now what do you say to that? I ask this people if that is the kind of gospel that is preached to this people to-day. And I say now that your people never had a better man than Watson.

I want to know how far back my brother is going. Of course I know he did not expect this thing to be sprung on him. It is a sort of left-hand lick, as the Benjamites of old gave.

I will now quote from page 87: "Forgetting that he who gave repentance and faith also gave the word; and that he who is exalted a Prince and Savior to give repentance unto the elect, also commanded that his gospel should be preached in the letter to all—to every creature. But the objector here repeats that all men will not receive its blessings, and why call on all to receive them?" Now, I ask you if you have ever preached Arminianism because they preached the gospel "to every creature," as it is put here? And I suppose you have here to-day as good a representation as you can muster.

Again, Watson says: "How mortifying to the feelings of a faithful preacher to be called an Arminian on account of preaching according to the very commission which Christ gave for the rule and government of his ministry. Brethren preachers, it is high time that we strive to please God in this affair rather than men." Yes, brother Hardy, it is high time

that you were striving to please God. I will show you that you are not nearly so strong as you imagine, and, indeed, I will show you what keeps your denomination alive at all. I ask you to look at page 516 of this same book, where the following passage occurs: "But the worst deviation of all is, that of our not exhorting both saint and sinner, as enjoined in the word of God. A gospel without exhortations may not be 'another gospel,' but it is not a full one." And that is the very charge I make on your people to-day, that they do not preach the full gospel, and have never done it since you separated yourself from the United Baptists, commencing in the year 1832, until it ended in Illinois in 1840.

Then hear what Watson says further: "Our cold doctrinal, nonexhorting way of preaching has doubtless already produced bad results." Yes, and you are dying on account of that very fact. That is what the best writer your denomination has says; that it has produced bad results in your denomination. Now, I want you to fall your timber on your own brother if that is wrong.

Watson proceeds then: "Who in the present day exhorts the brethren 'with many words' in regard to christian duties?—Acts xv. 32. Paul employed 'much exhortation,' we only a little. Who among us exhorts the gainsayers?—Titus i. 9. We have rather 'forgotten' the exhortations. Who among us ever repeat the words, 'Repent ye,' 'Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ,' without mixing up the strong doctrine of repentance and faith with the exhortation?" And I ask, Who of you do it now? "If the texts be used at all, we employ them only in a doctrinal, and not in an exhortatory way. We have lost both the spirit and words of exhortation. The very exhortations, admonitions, warnings and

threatenings of the Bible itself, when repeated from our pulpits are regarded by some ultraists as Arminianism. At least it would be very difficult for any one to preach them in their spiritual fullness without incurring the charge or reproach of Arminianism." And I say now that I have heard these very people that Watson speaks about stand up and call such texts as these Arminianism. I have heard them "from the Scriptures" and call it "an Arminian text," just as if it was not the word of God. You know where God in speaking says, "My Spirit," that brother Hardy and his people retort that it means Noah's spirit. Now, who ever heard such a doctrine as that fall from the lips of mortal man, where God says, "My Spirit," that man should claim that it refers to Noah's spirit! And again, where the text reads, "God commandeth all men to repent," their preachers say, "You know that is not so; you know God never commanded a man to do a thing but what he did it." And they go on to say that the church has no power to make a man repent. And so there are a great many other things of that sort, but I shall have to pass them by, and proceed with my quotations from their own author, Dr. Watson: "The very way of grace and mercy is to blend exhortations and admonitions with the commandment. God is a Sovereign, and could have given his commands without them; but as a God of mercy he commands and then exhorts, he exhorts and then admonishes, he admonishes and then warns. A stern ruler may give absolute order without admonition or warning, relying entirely on his authority to command; but the Lord does not thus deal with us; his way is a way of Fatherly love; he commands and then in mercy exhorts and warns. How great is the grace of exhortation! Shall the minister suppress this

grace and mercy in the pulpit? Shall he deny its utterance there? Now, brethren, I have come to the strong point, an undeniable truth, has not God joined the exhortations with the commandments? And how dare we preach one without the other? We have become too sensitive, and are not willing to suffer among brethren for the truth's sake.

"Some do not object if the believers only be exhorted, but contend it is wrong to exhort the impenitent sinner to repent, or the unbeliever to believe, because the doctrine of repentance and faith is that they are both the gifts of God. Has not the Lord ordained the preaching of his word to the very end?"

And yet this people deny that the gospel has a thing to do with the salvation of a sinner. They deny that the sinner is a subject of gospel address. I make that assertion, and if it is called in question at any time during this discussion, I will produce the evidence to prove it. I say that these people deny that a sinner is a subject of gospel address.

I now call your attention to page 518 of this same book, where the following occurs: "What do we learn from the sacred history of preaching? Peter preached repentance to the great congregation on the day of Pentecost, and to the multitude in the temple, saying, 'Repent ye.' Did not Paul, in declaring the unknown God to the Athenians, say that he 'commandeth all men everywhere to repent'—to all men everywhere is the commandment to repent? Peter exhorted even the wicked Simon to repent." Now, I will ask you, brother Hardy, will you get up and tell this people that this is your doctrine? If you do so, your own brethren will say at once that you contradict what has been preached all over this country for years and years. You will not do it—

you dare not do it ; for this is a charge put upon you by one of your own writers, and I adopt and make that same charge. The reason I adopt it is that because it is put in language much stronger than I have command of.

Then I turn to page 520, where the following occurs : "The Lord has ordained this way ; our violation of it in the nineteenth century will not cause it to fail ; others will do the work ; it needs must be done ; and this may be the cause why so few are coming into our churches. We have violated our commission. Let us search and try our ways, and turn again to the Lord." I ask you all to mark that passage, "And this may be the cause why so few are coming into our churches."

Brother Watson states distinctly what is the cause of your decline, and I will speak further on this subject before this discussion closes. Here is what Watson says : "We have violated our commission." I say that is the truth, and that is what you have to rectify.

"Let us preach to the 'many' as well as to the 'few,' take encouragement and call upon 'all men everywhere to repent,' and exhort them to do so with that zeal which constrained Paul to 'persuade men.'" Now, have you done that ? You say you have never left the doctrine of the Old Baptists, and here is one of your own writers that makes this remark. You say you have taught the same doctrine. Have you done it ? "Let us constantly declare that all things are now ready, both on the high places, and among the hedges, lanes and ditches." But say you, "We are sheep-feeders ; we cannot go among the hedges, lanes and ditches ;" and while thousands of people are starving for the truth, you still stay outside and refuse to go to them.

Hear what Watson says: "What if hearers make excuses, that does not invalidate our commission; it only shows its practical agreement with former results. Are we ashamed to labor, to 'compel' them to come in, as did ancient servants?" Now, I say to you, brother Hardy, that you and your people are ashamed of it. For what does Jesus Christ mean when he tells you to go out and tell them to come in? He says go out into "the hedges, lanes and ditches," and invite all the world to come in; and these are the "servants" of the Lord. And that was the belief of the ancient Baptists hundreds of years before the separation occurred. However, I will speak of that more fully when I come to give my negative proof in this discussion.

"But the objection is, that he cannot 'persuade' or 'compel' them to come in, and therefore it would be Arminianism to preach in that way. What, Arminianism to do the very things which the Lord has commanded?" That is what you say, that it is Arminianism to do as God has commanded you to do—Arminianism to do the very thing that God has commanded you to do. It is Arminianism that you are afraid of, and it is on that ground that you are heaping your vituperations upon a community of Missionary Baptists all over the land. Did not brother Hardy say in his opening argument that his people believed in the doctrine of salvation by grace? Well, what do the Missionary Baptists believe? The rules of this discussion lay down that you shall not charge your opponent with a thing until he avows it. Therefore I will not answer that point until he has avowed it.

But hear what Dr. Watson says further: "Whenever one of our ministers ventures to call on sinners to repent and believe the gospel, he begins directly afterwards to explain by

preaching the strong doctrine of repentance, instead of following up the commandment with the exhortations, warnings and threatenings of the Bible as he should, in conformity with the divine method. His aim or desire seems to be rather to convince his brethren that he is not an Arminian, than to exhort sinners to repent." And that is the very way they do, and all of you who have ever heard those preachers speak from the pulpit know that what I say is true.

Now, you want me to say something about free moral agency. Brother Hardy has had a great deal to say on the subject of free moral agency. What is a man if he is not a free agent? They say he is an agent in the hands of God. I presume as a machine is in the hands of his master—that he works when the Master works him. That is the kind of agency they believe in.

Hear what Watson says on that: "Here we see the commission of sin on the part of Adam from an internal personal source, and not from an external one, as in the case of Eve. Adam was *not deceived*; but through the mutability of his will and his moral free agency he willed to go into transgression with Eve." Adam was a free moral agent, but he willed to do what he did; he was not forced into it. If man is an agent of God, he could not act freely; if he can act freely, is not he a free moral agent? If a man does not act freely, he acts under restraint. Here is brother Hardy's own witness against him. The same author says: "Then sin may be said to issue from the defection of the creature, through his mutability, finitude and moral free agency, and not from an evil spirit coeternal with God, and the evils of sin are the punishments inflicted by the Lord, which are

graduated, controlled and directed by Him to prescribed issues." Man was not placed under the law of necessity, for if he were he would not be responsible for his actions, and could not act freely. The sinner, we learn from the Bible, is to be punished. God is the punisher; and if God is the punisher, the punishment is just. If the punishment is just, man is guilty; and if the man is guilty, he violated the law of God. And so man is a free moral agent; and if he is a free moral agent, he could have acted otherwise. I would like to know what conclusion can be drawn from this, except as I have stated; and if there is anything to be said on it, I would like to have brother Hardy answer my argument.

Now, if the means and instrumentalities are denied, they deny the use of them. Brother Hardy has said that he did not believe in the use of means. But hear what one of his own preachers (Dr. Watson) says on that subject: "Paul, however, does not affirm like some of our modern innovators," and that is all that these men are to-day. They are the innovators who are preaching throughout the land against us. Watson has no reference to our people, because he knew that we never did that. "Paul, however, does not affirm like some of our modern innovators that means or instrumentalities are not employed by the Lord in the divine plan of salvation." Brother Hardy's people deny that in this country. They deny emphatically means and instrumentalities, and have done it throughout this whole country. They deny that God has commanded the work that the Missionary Baptists are now carrying out in the world. And they have gone on and heaped their vituperations on the heads of these people who were doing that great work. Let me quote again this passage of Dr. Watson's: "Paul does not affirm like some of

our modern innovators that means or instrumentalities are not employed by the Lord in the divine plan of salvation; for he asks, 'How shall they hear without a preacher?' That is what Paul says about it; and I ask brother Hardy to answer the question, and I will give him two and a half days in which to do it. What makes the difference between Americans and the heathen nations?

I now read from Watson, page 532: "We have become reprehensibly careless about means." Yes; that is just exactly what your people have done, brother Hardy; "they have become reprehensibly careless about means." "Means in the hands of God partake of his power; in ours, of our strength only. We employ means with a prospect of success only in faith, irrespectively of any confidence in them apart from the power of God; so that all our duties, in that way, are performed as fully by faith in God, as though there were no means at all. The observance of such things become special duties performed according to the commandments of the Lord." That is what Dr. Watson says; and yet these people deny to thousands all over this land the use of means and instrumentalities. They say emphatically that the gospel in the hands of the preacher is not the means of salvation to the sinner; they deny that the gospel has anything to do with the salvation of the sinner; they deny that all over this land and country, and, consequently, heap their vituperations on the people because we do believe this doctrine and because we preach it, because we obey the divine commandments of God. They heap their vituperations and vilifications upon us for preaching the word according to God's divine commandments. "We should always employ means in faith; we should regard their employment on our

part only as a duty ; in this way the use of means is perfectly consistent with our doctrine ; and in this manner they were employed by all the Bible worthies. God has assuredly connected his work of grace in this world with many visible signs, outward duties, commandments, exhortations or means, as you may be pleased to name them. When one says he does not believe in the use of means, it amounts to his saying he does not believe in a performance of christian duties." That is exactly what it amounts to, and exactly what you have been doing throughout this land and country. You have denied "the use of means," and you have denied a belief in the "performance of christian duties." Consequently you, as a denomination, are dying as fast as you possibly can and if it were not for your taking members away from our church, members that had been excluded from our church, you would have been dead long ago. You have denied the use of means, and yet you have taken lost sheep into the fold, all the time heaping vituperation upon our people throughout this land and country, because they believe in protracted meetings, &c. I know what I am talking about, and I do not wish to misrepresent the teachings of these people at all in this discussion. Your people know these things to be true as well as I do. "Suppose Moses had said means are of no use." That is what you say. But Dr. Watson proceeds: "Suppose Moses had said means are of no use, neither the rod, nor the stretching forth of my arm can do good in this extremity; the leper, that the waters of Jordan cannot cure leprosy; Paul, that it is not necessary for the crew to remain in the ship; John, that it will be of no avail for me to say, repent; the disciples, that it will be of no avail to exhort and admonish the brethren. These servants did not act in

that way, but were careful to do all things which the Lord commanded, giving us thereby examples of duty, of faith, and regard for the ways of the Lord. Had we not better go and imitate their example than to stand still and controvert about them as many do in the present day?" Here again your brother asks you this question, and I ask you now, if you had not better do your duty as christians than to stand and controvert about these things. To preach the gospel is our work, it is the work of the minister, and the work of the servant of Jesus Christ; and God has called them to that work, and it is your duty, and our duty, to perform it as God has commanded. We ought not, as Dr. Watson says, stand still and controvert about such things. But, instead of that, you go about and say that it would be Arminianism to preach in this way. That is what you tell the people throughout this whole land and country. If this is wrong, as I have quoted from your own author, I ask you to fall your timber on him and not on me. I read it because it supports and proves my position, and I adopt it as the truth; and I know that there are people throughout this land and country, that are familiar with your preaching, that know it is the truth. I know that there are many of your people here to-day who know that what Watson says here is the truth. I know that these things are incontrovertible; and, consequently, I stand here to-day fearless of successful contradiction on the part of my opponent.

I have a great deal more to quote from in Watson, but I will just say to the congregation that I will make use of it again this evening. I will get through Watson this evening, and then take up another of their own histories, the "Old Baptist Test," published at Nashville and used by Fain.

After I have concluded with their own histories I will take up my negative proof to prove the position I have taken in the questions I have stated, and I will give my opponent just two days and a half in which to answer them. So, for the present, I will close.

---

### ELDER HARDY SAID:

[Afternoon Session.]

GENTLEMEN Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: I am again before you to pursue my subject. In my previous discourse I spoke from the Bible alone, but my opponent, in the place of taking the Bible to reply to me, takes up other books that have no reference whatever to the quotations I made. He has not in the least referred to my argument, and has made no attempt to answer it. He referred in the course of his remarks to a discussion that we had a little while previous across the river, and tells what he did over there. Now, if he will endeavor to reply to me on the present occasion, instead of going back to another time that has no connection whatever with this, I think he will be more in point. Though, as he has referred to that, I will say now that on that previous occasion I prefaced my argument with quotations from the Bible, as I have done on the present occasion; and he then, as on this occasion, never took up, or attempted to answer, one of those arguments.

Well, he says that we as a denomination did not have an existence previous to the year 1832; that in 1832 there sprung

up a new denomination, which he says was the Old Baptists, and that the Missionary Baptists were the church of Christ. I want to know why it is that the church of Christ, since it has had a new existence, can be the church of Christ when the Baptists never did receive baptism from the hands of any people previous to that time. If they were the church of Christ, and we are a new party, coming into existence in 1832, let him tell me why the church of Christ began to receive our baptism as soon as we came into existence. I do not know that it is my business on this occasion to put myself in the negative of the proposition. I understand that I am in the affirmative, and that it is brother Wallace's duty to reply to me. Consequently I will proceed with the thread of my argument.

I propose now to inquire into the succession of these people that I have talked about before, the people of God, the church of Christ. I propose to begin by asserting the succession of these people from the days of the Apostles down to the present time without a single solitary link being left out of the chain. I will first refer you, in confirmation of my position, to Jones's Church History, page 99, which shows that Paul the Apostle was put to death A. D. 66. I next turn to pages 128 and 129 of the same book (and I may say here that this Jones's Church History will be the only book that I will make quotations from in this speech): "The churches of Asia appear to have suffered dreadfully at this period. Polycarp was pastor of the church in Smyrna, an office which he held for more than eighty years, and which he had filled with honor to himself, to the edification of his christian brethren, and the glory of his divine Master. It only remained for him now to seal his testimony with his

blood. The eminence of his station soon marked him out as the victim of popular fury. The cry of the multitude against Polycarp was, 'This is the doctor of Asia, the father of the christians, the subverter of our gods, who teaches many that they must not perform the sacred rites, nor worship our deities. *Away with these Atheists!*' The philosophy of the emperor could not teach him that this pretended Atheism was a real virtue, which deserved to be encouraged and propagated amongst mankind. Here reason and philosophy failed him; and his blind attachment to the gods of his country caused him to shed much blood, and to become the destroyer of the saints of the living God.

"The friends of Polycarp, anxious for his safety, prevailed on him to withdraw himself from public view, and to retire to a neighboring village, which he did, continuing with a few of his brethren, day and night, in prayer to God, for the tranquillity of all the churches. The most diligent search was, in the mean time, made for him without effect. But when his enemies proceeded to put some of his brethren to the torture, with the view of compelling them to betray him, he could no longer be prevailed upon to remain concealed. 'The will of the Lord be done,' was his pious ejaculation; on uttering which he made a voluntary surrender of himself to his persecutors, saluted them with a cheerful countenance, and invited them to refresh themselves at his table, only soliciting from them on his own behalf one hour for prayer. They granted his request, and his devotions were prolonged to double the period, with such sweetness and savor that all who heard him were struck with admiration, several of the soldiers repenting that they were employed against so venerable an old man. His prayer being ended, they set him on an

ass, and conveyed him towards the city, being met on the road by Herod, the Irenarch, (a kind of justice of the peace,) and his father Nicetes, who were the chief agents in this persecution. Many efforts were made to shake his constancy, and induce him to abjure his profession; at one time he was threatened by the proconsul with the fury of wild beasts. 'Call for them,' said Polycarp, 'it does not become us to turn from good to evil.' 'Seeing you make so light of wild beasts,' said the magistrate, 'I will tame you with the more terrible punishment of fire.' But Polycarp bravely replied, 'You threaten me with a fire that is quickly extinguished, but are ignorant of the eternal fire of God's judgment, reserved for the wicked in the other world. But why do you delay? Order what punishment you please.' Thus, finding him impenetrable both to the arts of seduction and the dread of punishment, the fire was commanded to be lighted, and the body of this venerable father burnt to ashes, in the year 166."

I think no historian will dispute about the truth of the statements made in the quotation that I have made.

I will now refer you to pages 136 and 137: "A numerous church existed at Carthage in the latter end of the second and beginning of the third century, of which Tertullian was one of the pastors. He may be said to have flourished from the year 194 to 229."

Then turn to pages 157 and 158, of the same book: "Power was an engine of support to the different factions; and the sword of persecution, which, for three centuries, had been drawn by the Pagans against the followers of Christ."

Also see pages 180 and 181: "It may be proper to remark; that long before the times of which we now treat, some christians had seen it their duty to withdraw from the communion

of the church of Rome. The first instance of this that we find on record, if we except that of Tertullian, is the case of Novatian, who, in the year 251, was ordained the pastor of a church in the city of Rome, which maintained no fellowship with the Catholic part. It is a difficult matter, at this very remote period, to ascertain the real grounds of difference between Novatian and his opponents. Those who are in any tolerable degree conversant with theological controversy, will scarcely need to be apprised how much caution is necessary to guard against being misled by the false representations which different parties give of each other's principles and conduct. Novatian is said to have refused to receive into the communion of the church any of those persons who, in the time of persecution, had been induced, through fear of sufferings or death, to apostatize from their profession, and offer sacrifices to the heathen deities; a principle which he founded upon a mistaken view of Hebrews vi. 4, 6. We may readily conceive how interesting and difficult a subject this must have been to all the churches of Christ in those distressing times, and the danger that must have arisen from laying down any fixed rule of conduct that should apply to all cases that would come before them; or even verging towards an extreme on either side of this question. The following is the account given of Novatian by the late Mr. Robert Robinson, in his *Ecclesiastical Researches*, page 126; and I the more readily submit it to the reader, because none who knew Mr. Robinson can for a moment suspect him of having any undue predilection for the principles of Novatian. 'He was,' says he, 'an elder in the church of Rome, a man of extensive learning, holding the same doctrine as the church did, and published several treatises in defense of what he be-

lieved. His address was eloquent and insinuating, and his morals irreproachable. He saw with extreme pain the intolerable depravity of the church. Christians, in the space of a very few years, were caressed by one emperor and persecuted by another. In seasons of prosperity, many persons rushed into the church for base purposes. In times of adversity, they denied the faith, and reverted again to idolatry. When the squall was over, away they came again to the church, with all their vices, to deprave others by their examples. The bishops, fond of proselytes, encouraged all this, and transferred the attention of christians from the old confederacy for virtue, to vain shows at Easter, and other Jewish ceremonies, adulterated too with paganism. On the death of Bishop Fabian, Cornelius, a brother elder, and a violent partisan for taking in the multitude, was put in nomination. Novatian opposed him; but as Cornelius carried his election, and he saw no prospect of reformation, but on the contrary a tide of immorality pouring into the church, he withdrew, and a great many with him. Cornelius, imitated by Cyprian, who was just in the same condition, through the remonstrances of virtuous men at Carthage, and who was exasperated beyond measure with one of his own elders, named Novatus, who had quitted Carthage and gone to Rome to espouse the cause of Novatian, called a council and got a sentence of excommunication passed against Novatian. In the end Novatian formed a church and was elected bishop. Great numbers followed his example, and all over the empire *Puritan* churches were constituted and flourished through the succeeding two hundred years. Afterwards, when penal laws obliged them to lurk in corners, and worship God in

private, they were distinguished by a variety of names, and *a succession of them continued till the Reformation.*"

Page 282: "'Here then,' says Dr. Allix, very truly, 'we have found a body of men in Italy, *before the year one thousand and twenty-six*, five hundred years before the Reformation, who believed contrary to the opinions of the church of Rome, and who highly condemned their errors.' Atto, bishop of Verceulli, had complained of such people *eighty years before*, and so had others before him, and there is the highest reason to believe that they had always existed in Italy."

Page 283: "About the year 1040, the Paterines had become very numerous at Milan, which was their principal residence, and here they flourished at least two hundred years. They had no connection with the [Catholic] church."

I will just remark here, without turning and reading it, that in 1120 the Waldenses wrote out their Articles of Faith, and published them to the world in the year 1220; and these Articles of Faith stand recorded on page 323 of Jones's Church History.

Now, I next call your attention to page 310. Reinerius Saccho, "about the year 1250, published a catalogue of the errors of the Waldenses under three and thirty distinct heads."

Turn to page 383 of this same work: "In the year 1210, twenty-four persons of the sect of the Waldenses were seized in the city of Paris, some of whom were imprisoned, and others committed to the flames. In the year 1334, the monks of the inquisition, who were deputed to search after the Waldenses, apprehended one hundred and fourteen of them at Paris, who were burnt alive, sustaining their torture with admirable fortitude."

Page 426 : “ In the year 1533, George Moel, one of the pastors of a church of the Waldenses, published memoirs of the history of their churches, in which he states that at the time he wrote there were above eight hundred thousand persons professing the religion of the Waldenses ; nor will this appear an exaggerated statement if we consider the view that was given, in the last section, of their dispersion throughout almost every country of Europe—the immense numbers that suffered martyrdom ; and what was formerly mentioned that in the year 1315, namely, two centuries before this time, there were eighty thousand of them in the small kingdom of Bohemia.”

Page 464 : “ An edict was issued in favor of the Waldenses, bearing date the 5th of June, 1561, granting them the privilege of holding their public assemblies in all the usual places, free from molestation ; and that such of them as had been injured by the seizure and confiscation of their property should have it restored, or receive a compensation for the same.”

Page 472 : “ In the year 1601, Bartholomew Copin, a Waldensian of the valley of Lucerne, had occasion to attend a public fair at Ast, a city in Piedmont, to which he had brought for sale some articles of merchandise,” &c.

Page 504 : “ About the month of May, 1655, that many hundreds of the poor Protestants in the valleys of Piedmont, (otherwise known by the name of Waldenses) within the territory of the Duke of Savoy, were most cruelly massacred by a Popish party.”

Page 525 : “ The tranquillity of the Waldenses in Piedmont was now first invaded by a proclamation issued by the governor of the valleys, about the end of the year 1685.”

I have now brought this people up to the year 1685, and I will now proceed to speak of them as they were on the American continent. In 1707 there was an organization called the Philadelphia Association. The Red River Association was organized in 1680, and the Little River Association was organized in 1813. That, I think, is going far enough back; but I will refer you to another book that I think is equally as good testimony as that which I have already produced. I refer you to Maclaine's Mosheim's Ecclesiastical History. I will not turn to the various passages and read from them, because my time is too limited, but I will give you the pages, which the inquiring may at leisure turn to.

On page 32, Mosheim refers to the church as it was in the years 64 and 94. On page 55, he refers to the church in the year 177. On page 78, he refers to the church in the year 211. On page 80, he refers to the church in the year 249. On page 81, he refers to the church in the year 270. On page 99, he refers to the church in the years 311-324. On page 105, he refers to the christian church in the years 330-370. On page 134, he refers to the church in the year 421. On page 170, he refers to the church in the years 524-591. On page 176, he refers to the church in the year 650. On page 200, he refers to the church in the year 775. On page 208, he refers to the church in the year 867. On page 209, he refers to the church in 827. On page 229, he refers to the church in 866. On page 236, he refers to the church in 897. On page 253, he refers to the church in 1090. On page 295, he refers to the church in 1017. On page 330, he refers to the church in 1148. On page 331, he refers to the church in 360-380. On page 371, he refers to the church in 1262. On page 375, he refers to the church in 1209. On page 383, he

refers to the church in 1307. On page 392, he refers to the church in 1387-1415. And on page 399, he refers to the church in 1472-1506. In volume second, page 35, Mosheim refers to the church in 1533, and on page 886 he refers to the church in 1632, 1655 and 1685.

Now, who will come up and say that we have not shown the identity of these people from the time of the Apostles down to the present time? Show me where there is a link out of the chain. No person will try to do it.

I want next to refer to these people, and tell some of the things they believed. They believed just like the Regular Baptists of to-day believe, and they frequently state the things that they do not believe. In Jones's Church History, page 310, the following occurs: "They affirm that they alone are the church of Christ and his disciples. They declare themselves to be the Apostles' successors, to have Apostolic authority and the keys of binding and loosing. They hold the church of Rome to be the whore of Babylon."

Jones's Church History, page 251: "But you should remember that he only is Apostolic who is the keeper and guardian of the Apostles' doctrine." Now, you see they regarded no person as Apostolic, only those who are the keepers and guardians of the Apostolic doctrine.

Page 43 of the same book: "But the problem is solved by admitting the scriptural account of the depravity of the human mind, its alienation from God, and its natural enmity against his truth." Did these people not believe in the doctrine of total depravity? Brother Wallace has said that I would say no more about the doctrine of free agency. He professes to believe the doctrine of total depravity. Now, I

want him to reconcile the two, and tell me how a person could be totally depraved and at the same time a free agent.

I refer you now to Jones's Church History, page 344: "He then gives a summary of their doctrinal principles, for the sake of which they have been persecuted, such as 'that the Holy Scriptures contain all things necessary to our salvation, and that we are called to believe only what they teach, without any regard to the authority of man; that nothing else ought to be received by us except what God hath commanded.'"

Then on page 410: "In 1433, the terms contained in the following four articles, which goes by the name of *The Bohe-mian Compactata*, or terms of agreement:

"1. That the word of God shall be freely preached by able ministers, according to the Holy Scriptures, without any human invention."

In Benedict's first volume, page 130, the following passage occurs: "The grand *maxim*, which is thus acknowledged to be the true source of all the peculiarities of the Mennonites, and of all the ancient Waldenses, is most fairly stated, and when stripped of the verbose attire with which the learned doctor has arrayed it, is by every Baptist most heartily adopted. This *maxim* goes to exclude all the inventions and traditions of men." He says the Baptists heartily indorse this, which they do.

Benedict's first volume, page 119: "The beginning of the thirteenth century saw thousands of persons burned or hanged by these diabolical devices, whose sole crime was that they trusted only in Jesus Christ for salvation, and renounced all the vain hopes of self-righteous idolatry and superstition."

Then, I refer you to Orchard's Church History, page 135: "From the blood and ashes of the first Paulican victims a succession of teachers and congregations repeatedly arose. The Greeks, to subdue them, made use both of arguments and arms, with all the terror of penal laws, without effecting their object. The great instrument of this people's multiplication was *the alone* use of the New Testament."

Again, see Mosheim's first volume, page 42: "The progress of christianity is not to be attributed to human means, but to a divine power." That is what we believe, brethren.

The same book, page 296: "They declared the use of instrumental music in the churches, and other religious assemblies, superstitious and unlawful. They denied that the cross on which Christ suffered was in any respect more sacred than other kinds of wood, and in consequence refused to pay to it the smallest degree of religious worship."

---

REV. MR. WALLACE SAID:

I AM before you again for the purpose of resuming the argument that I commenced this morning. My brother Hardy has spoken to you for half an hour, and I ask you what he has said or done. He has quoted, in support of his position, from Missionary Baptist works. He said he would show a Baptist succession from the days of the Apostles down to the present time. He has quoted from Jones's Church History, which is a Missionary Baptist work. He says it is a good

book: that is so. It is a truthful book, because it is a Missionary Baptist work, and written by a Missionary Baptist. Then he refers to Benedict's History, and to Orchard's Baptist History, which are both Missionary works, and published by the Missionary Baptists. Now, am I here to deny the assertions of these books? I think it would be more proper for brother Hardy, in attempting to establish his position, to quote from works of members of his own denomination. I want him to understand that I can hold my own ground on this occasion without any suggestions from him as to the books to be referred to. Whenever I come to the time of assuming the burden of proof, I propose to set up these very things.

I have asked you to show whether you ever had a separate denomination prior to the year 1832. I ask you where you, as a separate denomination, existed prior to that time, and so far I have failed to see where you have attempted to answer it. Brother Hardy, you and I were once together in the same church. Now, when we were together in the same church, I want to ask you whether or not that church was the church of Christ. I want you to answer whether, when we were united, we were in the church of Christ. That is a pertinent question, and I am not here to deny the assertions and quotations made from Missionary Baptist works.

Brother Hardy said that he did not reply to any argument of mine, from the fact that I had not turned to any of the passages in the Scripture that he had quoted. Well, did not I reply to his remarks on the subject of election and atonement, and when I presented the true teachings of our people on the question of atonement, and asked him to refute them, did not I say that he would not answer me? I say that by

atonement is meant the opening up a way for the exercise of mercy, and that way has been opened to all the human family, that they might take refuge in it. The sinner has been invited to come and be saved, without any distinction whatever. For it is said, "He that believeth shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned." And if a sinner is damned, it is because he is under the law of unbelief, and in consequence of that he denies the record of God. The curse of sin has been on all mankind, as in the beginning of the world, and since Cain murdered his own brother; and it has remained in the human family from that time until this.

My brother asked me to answer the question why it is that up to 1832 we received no baptism. What does our Association say about that? Does not our Association emphatically urge baptism? I know that there are irregularities in our church, and I am not here to defend them. I am not here to say that our church has never done wrong, for I know better than that. I know that some of our independent churches have said that they on some occasions received immersion. I have stood up against that thing, and brother Spencer knows that I have done it in our denomination; but I am not here to defend these irregularities; I am here to defend our faith and our doctrine.

I have asked brother Hardy to come to time, and answer questions I have put to him. I will do it myself after awhile, when I come to take up the burden of proof. He has asked me to reconcile total depravity and free agency. That point will come up in proper time.

We will see what Watson has to say of these subjects. I now turn to page 519 of that book: "These questions, when properly answered, show most conclusively that we should

preach repentance towards God, and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, 'to every,' to 'all men everywhere.' If we say our preaching is to the called of the Lord, and to them only, and make no distinction between the many called and the few chosen, we will involve the tenet of Universalism. For if we preach only to the 'quickened,' all must be in that state, as our commission and work embraces 'every creature.' "

Now what is meant here by the word "quicken?" "Quick-en," in its primary sense, means to make right, and here in this connection it is used in the sense of conviction, and that interpretation of it agrees with the divine word. So when a man arrives at the age of maturity he comes to God, and the divine Spirit of God quickens him, as far as this world is concerned; and consequently it agrees with free moral agency. I tell you here to-day, my brethren, that if a sinner is not saved, it is not God's fault. Brother Hardy has preached all over this country the doctrine of salvation of sinners by the will of God. They cannot deny that fact. Then he tells you that the Missionary Baptists are a very diversified people; that they are not in accord in their doctrine. But we are; we are a people in perfect harmony as regards doctrine, and always have been. Has that been the case with these people? I ask them to remember what kind of fussing and divisions and schisms they have had among them. Ever since I have known of them they have been in trouble among themselves of one kind and another. They are in perfect harmony, they say. Let me ask you if you have an element among you of nonresurrectionism. I want you to come up after that and speak about your harmony. I tell you that as a people you have had more fusses among you than any people I ever knew.

I now call your attention to Watson again, on page 509, on the subject of the support of ministers of the gospel: "Where is the pastor who faithfully and constantly preaches the duties of the church to her pastor, or the church that fully and perseveringly discharges her duty towards her pastor? Let him and her report themselves; but observe, the exceptions will not be admitted merely on account of what they may have done, unless the work accords with the precepts and examples of the New Testament. Such an instance, I fear, cannot be reported.

Brother Hardy gets up here and speaks of the case of old brother Fulkerson, who went to Kansas for the purpose of ordaining a church, and says that the brethren in Illinois paid his expenses. This I suppose was missionary work. A man is sent from one part of the country to another to help in the organization of a church, and his expenses are paid. Now, do you denominate this missionary work? There are people here I know who know something about missionary work, and they can answer for themselves. "How appropriate and necessary is the interchange of spiritual and temporal things, as instituted by the Lord, between the pastor and church. This temporal relation is lost! I will not merely refer to the texts in point, but quote them." He then goes on and quotes the texts to show the word of God in this matter, showing that God has ordained the support of the ministry. Proceeding, Watson says: "The preacher does not become a beggar until his demands transcend his scriptural rights, nor a hireling, until his wages exceed Bible rights." Now, what is the Bible right? Who knows better what it costs to support a minister than the minister himself? Who knows better what it costs to support a mechanic than the

mechanic himself? Who knows better than a contractor what it costs to build a railroad? Who knows better how much it costs to build a ship than the builder of it? And who knows better what it costs to support the minister than the minister himself? He knows, and God's divine word requires that he should have his support. "The preacher does not become a beggar until his demands transcend his scriptural rights." So, if a preacher takes a dollar from his church, is he a beggar? This is one point in brother Hardy's chain that I think is broken; and my understanding is that if one link in a chain is broken, that the whole fabric is destroyed. If you spoil one note in music you spoil the harmony, and if one of their preachers take a dollar from their churches it spoils their whole professions. Then why is it that these people vilify us for doing the very thing that their own writers say is right, and which they do themselves. I will proceed with Watson: "While defending and maintaining his just pastoral rights, he is no beggar, cap in hand, beseeching his brethren for some poor pittance or other, but a dignified, independent asserter of his just claims, and should be so regarded by all who have ears to hear the commandments of the Lord, or a heart to practice them. How many debts of this kind, with accumulated interest, rest at this time as so many dark spots on many of our churches! How many preachers are there who are toiling five days in a week who are not like brother Hardy and myself, somewhat independent of support from their people. I know I have never received one hundred dollars of pay for pastoral work in my life. I support myself, and I do not want any pay; and yet we are charged all over this land and country with being hirelings.

Now, says Watson: "Their payment would loosen many pastoral hands that are toiling five days in the week, without time for reading or study, to preach two! Many hearts that are burdened now almost beyond endurance under a sense of the neglect of brethren, would be made joyful; the way of pastoral duty would no longer be the way of domestic loss and neglect! The only time which many of our preachers have to read and study the word of God, is after a hard day's work, when they should be asleep." I tell you that that is the case with many of us. I know I have sat up many a night until twelve o'clock studying and laboring in God's service after I have put in a hard day's labor. I have often labored five days in the week and studied at night, when I should have been asleep in order to qualify myself for the service of God. I would, if I could not be the best preacher, that I might be the worst, and I took these hours, when I should have been asleep, in order to study the divine word of God, so that I might qualify myself. And such things, Dr. Watson says, are "as so many dark spots," which if removed would enable many of our preachers to go forth and give light to the world. That is the testimony of your own preacher and writer. "Many worthy pastors are in this condition, and many brethren who seem otherwise worthy, appear not to have eyes to see this state of things, the fruit of their reprehensible neglect. To all such I am constrained to say, go read the ninth chapter of First Corinthians, read the entire chapter, read it attentively, and if you can, after its perusal, lay the holy volume down with a good conscience, unless in pauper circumstances, you must be either a worshiper of mammon, and not of God, or a reader, and not a doer of the word. Let none suppose that I am con-

tending for my own advantage." Dr. Watson did not need that, he had plenty; but there were others of his brethren that he knew were in just the position that he has described here, and that is why he spoke so earnestly.

Now, on page 512, he says further: "The New Testament has no fixed rates, but only plain precepts; gospel charity, which is love, will assess high rates; covetousness, which is idolatry, low ones, if any at all!—perhaps reproaches only." So I say that these people here when their ministers demand money, instead of giving up the money for their support cast reproaches on them. "This unscriptural gag must be resisted before the muzzle will be taken off." Here he says that the preacher must speak out, not only on their own authority, but on the Lord's, which is the best authority in the world. "Preachers must speak out on this subject, not on their own authority, but on the Lord's! Not in their own words, but in the plain, strong ones of the Bible; not as religious beggars of the day, but as faithful pastors. The correction of this error, now causing so many hearts to mourn, must, after all, begin in the pulpit."

Page 513: "Occasionally a circular letter written on the subject has appeared in the minutes of our Associations, but they have been utterly disregarded." Now, says Watson, the matter was brought up in a circular letter, but has been utterly disregarded in their associations. Now, as there are so many Baptist brethren standing before me to-day I would like you to tell me one thing: When you have had a circular letter in your Association; I would like to know when you ever heard of one; did you ever hear of any in the Red River Association on that subject? Just answer me that question. I know I must seem to talk in a fighting

mood, but I cannot help that. I have my faults I know, and I would to God it were otherwise. I do not want to hurt anybody's feelings. I only wish to present the truth, and I propose to do it, and I leave it to my brother to answer these questions that I have propounded to him, and I give him just two days and a half in which to do it.

---

### ELDER HARDY SAID:

GENTLEMEN Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: I am again before you to resume the discussion here. My brother seems to rely greatly on Dr. Watson, and it would seem, from his actions and remarks here to-day, that he prefers Dr. Watson to the Bible. Now, I think I have seen Dr. Watson's work once in my life, and I will take it up at this time; and if I do not silence his battery upon that subject, it will be a wonder to me.

Mr. Wallace evidently wants to impress it on the minds of this people that Dr. Watson, being identified with the Baptists, took the whole Baptist system. That is not true; he did not do it.

Watson, page 43: "*Primitive* christians would not have preferred the charges against a *primitive* church which *modern* ones do against this church. I will mention some of these charges:

- "1. That we believe in particular election.
- "2. That repentance and faith are the gifts of God.
- "3. That we believe in the *effectual* calling of God's elect.

"4. The final perseverance of believers.

"5. Baptism of believers only, and that by immersion only.

"6. That we practice feet washing.

"7. In not doing anything on man's authority.

"8. And that good works are the fruits of God's gracious work on the heart of the believer, and not *the cause* of it.

"To all of these charges we plead guilty."

Watson, page 60: "'Strait is the gate,' and who can enlarge, open or shut it? 'Narrow is the way,' and who can widen or alter it? 'Few there be that find it,' and who can add to their number? To attempt to do these things would be worse folly than to essay to widen the ocean and multiply the stars of heaven."

Watson, page 66: "The Missionary Baptists may say that infant baptism is a part of the Catholic system; but the Pedobaptist may with as much propriety say that a missionary system based on human authority is also a part of the ecclesiastical policy of Catholics."

Page 83: "'Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature; and he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned.' Every creature, bond and free, male and female, all sorts, all grades, from the king to the peasant, in all countries, and in all times and ages, are included in this broad and general commission. But, observe, preaching the gospel according to this commission, latitudinous as it is, never did nor ever will add to the number of God's chosen ones."

Page 105: "Our denominational views of personal and unconditional election were plainly taught to them by Paul. Their state of utter depravity before conversion is what we now contend for. Their calling was of God, as we say ours

was. Their ministry was of God, without the intervention of missionary societies, as ours is."

Page 106: "Who ever saw a Baptist of the old order, in fellowship with his brethren, in a 'Poor-house?' Who ever saw one begging bread? Who ever saw one *hiring* himself to preach for a modern institution? Who ever met one on a mission of proselyting? Answer."

Page 125: "The soul that is saved by grace, must admit that it is by the grace, the very grace given for its salvation personally in Christ before the world began, and that through Christ it never fails; a failure of grace would be equal to a failure of Christ!"

Page 141: "'I know them,' said the Savior. He knows them in their day and times in Africa as well as in England or America. He will certainly bring them in as if they were born in either of these christian countries. His foreknowledge and predestination have the same connection with them in their calling and justification, that they have with those in the most enlightened christian countries."

Page 164: "We cannot, therefore, go in fellowship with a *modern order* of Baptists who have instituted, on human authority, an assembly, governed by enactments of their own, and called a general association. Through this assembly *modern* missionary operations are performed in a manner which Primitive Baptists never practiced." Now, brother Wallace, Dr. Watson notes the truth, does he not?

Page 225: "Suppose that all nations were taught the literal truths of the gospel, what would then be necessary? Would a 'demonstration of the Spirit' take any other way but that of election, predestination and foreordination? If not, something besides preaching is essentially necessary, by which we

discover that preaching is different from all other kinds of public speaking. Its success depends more on the election and foreordination of God than anything else." That sounds something like old Hard-shell doctrine, doesn't it? This writer is evidently a Missionary and a Hard-shell both, for he preaches both ways. Now, if a witness comes up and testifies on one side, and then testifies upon the other side, I ask those here now if his testimony is worth anything. Should it not be thrown out of court? Yet brother Wallace tells me that I am quoting from his histories. Very good.

I want now to refer you to Mosheim's first volume, page 296, where he says that the Baptists "declared instrumental music in the churches, and other religious assemblies, superstitious and unlawful." What! regard instrumental music in their churches as superstition! How do the Missionary Baptists regard that thing to-day? If this is Missionary Baptist testimony, I want to know if the Missionary Baptists of to-day have not departed from their ancient principles, and if it is not proved by this book. Do not they have instrumental music in their churches?

I will now carry you to Camp's history, which is a Missionary work. 298th page: "The learned in human learning do commonly and for the most part err, and know not the truth, but persecute it, and the professors of it; and therefore are no further to be followed than we see them agree with truth." And now, brethren, take that advice, and do not follow any further than is laid down here.

In the same book, on page 334, the following passage occurs: "Christ's true ministers have not their learning and wisdom from men, or from universities or human schools, for human learning, arts and sciences are not essential to the

making of a true minister; but only the gift of God, which cannot be bought with silver or gold. And, also, as they have freely received the gift of God, so they do freely administer; they do not preach for hire, for gain, or filthy lucre. They are not like false teachers, who look for gain from their quarters, who eat the fat, and clothe themselves with the wool, and kill them that are fed; those that put not into their mouths they prepare war against."

I will refer to Mosheim again on this subject, page 61, first volume: "The christian system, as it was hitherto taught, preserved its native and beautiful simplicity, and was comprehended in a small number of articles. The public teachers inculcated no other doctrines than those which are contained in what is commonly called the Apostles' Creed."

Page 227. I will read from here a clause of the articles of faith, and the belief of the Baptists as they were in the year 860, over one thousand years ago: "That God did not desire or will the salvation of all mankind, but that of the elect only; and that Christ did not suffer death for the whole human race, but for those persons only whom God has predestined to eternal salvation." Now, is not that something like our Old Baptists of to-day preach? Brother Wallace said that he never knew any Old Baptists until the year 1832, but here we have in the year 860 a people that believed this thing, and were persecuted for it to such an extent that they had to resort to dens and caves of the earth for protection. I say that that is the very identical doctrine that the Regular Baptists preach to-day.

Then turn to Jones's Church History, page 323, where you will find set forth the articles of faith of the Waldenses. Brother Wallace tells you that this, too, is a Missionary

Baptist work; but it would be hard for me to believe that, simply from the fact that it was written long prior to the time that there were any Missionary Baptists. I will read a few clauses of these articles of faith as set forth by these people in the year 1120. They are tolerably lengthy, and I will not read them all, but I will commence with the first article:

“1. We believe and firmly maintain all that is contained in the twelve articles of the symbol, commonly called the Apostles’ Creed, and we regard as heretical whatever is inconsistent with the said twelve articles.

“2. We believe that there is one God, the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.

“3. We acknowledge for sacred canonical scriptures the books of the Holy Bible. (Here follows the title of each, exactly conformable to our received canon, but which it is deemed, on that account, quite unnecessary to particularize.)

“4. The books above mentioned teach us: That there is ONE GOD, almighty, unbounded in wisdom, and infinite in goodness, and who in his goodness has made all things. For he created Adam after his own image and likeness. But through the enmity of the devil and his own disobedience, Adam fell, sin entered into the world, and we became transgressors in and by Adam.

“5. That Christ had been promised to the fathers who received the law, to the end that, knowing their sin by the law, and their unrighteousness and insufficiency, they might desire the coming of Christ to make satisfaction for their sins, and to accomplish the law by himself.

“6. That at the time appointed of the Father, Christ was born, a time when iniquity everywhere abounded, to make it manifest that it was not for the sake of any good in ourselves,

for all were sinners, but that he, who is true, might display his grace and mercy towards us.

“7. That Christ is our life, and truth, and peace, and righteousness, our shepherd and advocate, our sacrifice and peace, who died for the salvation of all who should believe, and rose again for their justification.”

I will then skip to the 10th and 11th articles which are as follows:

“10. Moreover, we have ever regarded all the inventions of men (in the affairs of religion) as an unspeakable abomination before God; such as the festival days and vigils of saints, and what is called holy water, the abstaining from flesh on certain days, and such like things, but above all, the masses.

“11. We hold in abhorrence all human inventions, as proceeding from antichrist, which produces distress, and are prejudicial to the liberty of the mind.”

Then I will read the 12th article, and I will call your attention to it.

“12. We consider the Sacraments as signs of holy things, or as the visible emblems of invisible blessings. We regard it as proper and even necessary, that believers use these symbols or visible forms when it can be done. Notwithstanding which, we maintain that believers may be saved without these signs, when they have neither place nor opportunity of observing them.

“13. We acknowledge no Sacraments (as of divine appointment) but baptism and the Lord's supper.

“14. We honor the secular powers with subjection, obedience, promptitude, and payment.”

Now, I want you to notice these articles for a moment. I suppose my time is about up, and I will be as brief as pos-

sible. You will notice that this people mentioned here in the year 1120 positively declared that they regarded the inventions of men, not only a portion of the inventions of men, but that "we regard the inventions of men as an unspeakable abomination before God." Now, the question is, Where are the people to-day that regard the inventions of men as an unspeakable abomination before God? You know that you cannot find them outside of the Regular Baptists. They are the only people that stand on the principles of the Bible. They are the only people that stand on the principles maintained and as set forth by the ancient Baptists.

My brother asked me whether we had ever made the articles of faith a test of fellowship. Now, I just ask him, inasmuch as he is in the negative in this discussion, to tell me the object of the Baptists writing out and publishing to the world their articles of faith. I want him to tell me what their motive was—what they had in view.

There is another article of faith that comes in connection here, but I am afraid I will not have time to read it to-day, and I will leave that until to-morrow morning. However, I wish to speak a little in regard to the articles of faith that I have referred to.

I understand that when people write out their articles of faith and publish them to the world, their object is to set forth the doctrinal sentiments that they as a denomination profess to believe; and if that is not the object of the articles of faith of the Baptists now, and if it was not the object of the Baptists anciently, just tell me what was the object. Now, these people were persecuted, and history says that they had to resort to dens and caves of the earth in order to hide themselves from their enemies. Yet we find that while

this persecution was raging against that people, that they wrote these articles of faith and published them to the world in order to let their enemies know what they did believe. I take it that they did this, simply from the fact that they were misrepresented, just as the Regular Baptists of to-day are misrepresented. They were evil spoken of and misrepresented. And I say to my brother Wallace, that when he speaks of the misrepresentations by our people of his, it would come with better grace if his people would tell the truth about the Regular Baptists, and would not persecute them as they do. He has stated a great many things, and among them he has said that we were opposed to preaching to sinners. Let me tell you now, that no person has ever heard me say in the pulpit that I would refuse in any instance to preach to the sinner. I tell you, when I preach, I preach to the whole congregation, no matter how it is. I would not discriminate between my congregation. He says that when we preach, we preach only to the sheep. Now, when did you ever hear a Regular Baptist use such an expression? I say when I preach, I preach that the congregation may be benefited, and I preach to all that are within the sound of my voice. I have never refused to do that in my life; and, more than that, I have never refused to preach to a sinner. True, we do not single them out. There are portions of the Bible that apply to the sinner directly, I know, and there are other portions that apply to the believer; and when it applies to one, it does not apply to the other, as the scripture is written. But these people go further, and in dividing the word of truth they give the honest portion to the sinner. Now we want to stop right where the Bible stops. When we come to

the part of the Bible applicable to the sinner, we apply it to him; and when we come to the part applicable to the believer, we give that to him.

In this connection I want to reply to one quotation made by brother Wallace. He quoted in support of his position, "Behold, I stand at the door and knock; if any man hear my voice, and open the door, I will come in to him." Brother Wallace says that that was applied to the sinner, that it was the sinner that was required to open the door, and he would receive the Lord. But what does the Bible say? In the same text it shows distinctly that he was then speaking to the churches, and that text was applied to the churches of Christ, and not to the sinner. And it is applied to the church to-day; and if we are in disobedience, it is our duty to open our doors and receive the Lord Jesus Christ, and nothing else.

I am going to prove to you that these people that I have been speaking of have come down from the days of the Apostles, and I will show it to you by the best testimony in the world. So far as Mr. Wallace's authorities have gone, I have only to say, taking an apt illustration, that when your opponent in court brings up his witnesses, and you take these witnesses and prove your own position, I want to know if that is not the best evidence; or if his witnesses come up first and testify in his behalf, and then testify in my behalf, is it not proper, and is it not according to common sense, that they should be thrown out of court? But I tell you that they testify in my behalf, and not in his behalf. I say distinctly that he cannot trace his people back to the days of the Apostles, because there are no histories in existence by which he can support his claim.

REV. MR. WALLACE SAID:

GENTLEMEN Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: I am before you to resume my argument. I asked brother Hardy awhile ago to argue his own side of the question, but he seems determined to wander off into mine.

Now, as to the point of discrimination, has not he contradicted himself? When I made the statement that they did discriminate, did I state what was untrue? No. First he says they do discriminate; now he says 'they don't. I tell you I have been under their preaching since I was a boy, and I know what I am talking about when I say they do discriminate. I ask this people now if the statement made here that they do discriminate is a truthful statement. I will leave it to the Baptist brethren assembled here to-day. I quoted from Dr. Watson to prove that point, and now he brings up this same author to prove that he (Watson) did not agree in all they believe. I have taken Dr. Watson and proved their deviations; and notwithstanding this, brother Hardy says his denomination preaches more gospel than any other. I know that Watson heaps his vituperations on the Missionaries, but what does brother Hardy now say? He says if a man testifies on one side, and then turns around and testifies on the other side, that his testimony must be thrown out of court. You are going to throw Watson out, are you? Pitch him out of doors, if you dare, and say he is not worthy of belief. I know that while Watson goes on to show your deviations, he at the same time protests against our denomination. As

to Mosheim, he is a Lutheran missionary, and not a Baptist at all. He quotes Dr. Watson about the sheep in Africa. How came they there? Dr. Watson says that they will be preached to; he says, "If we don't carry this gospel to all the world, there is a people that will do it." Well, he has gone over to Africa and gotten up the sheep there. Were there any sheep there before the gospel was preached there? How many believers had you, brother Hardy, among them, before the gospel was preached to them? I do not think brother Hardy will answer that question. I asked him awhile ago to answer me as to what was the difference between the American and the heathen nations. He has not answered that, nor any of the other questions I propounded to him. I said before I would give him two and a half days to answer it in; I will now extend it to three days. This congregation knows the questions I put, among them being, Were we in the church of Christ when we were united? I repeat, he has not answered one of these questions, nor will he.

He has mentioned something about articles of faith. I asked him in a previous discourse if they had ever made articles of faith a test of fellowship. He turns around and asks me as to what was the object of getting up articles of faith. He answered that question himself. He thought I could not come up to it, and so he would answer it himself. He says there were Baptists from the days of the Apostles up to the time of writing these articles of faith he has referred to. Well, how did they get along without articles of faith up to that time? How many years was it? I believe he said somewhere about eleven hundred. They had no articles of faith up to the year 1100. Now, I want to know what became of the Baptists during that time when they had no articles of

faith. They must have been in a strange predicament. I will show you what kept them together when I reach that point, when I reach the burden of proof.

Brother Hardy then talks about the "inventions of men," and goes back to the Waldenses, and says that his people are the only people that ever stood on that ground. When did you see these inventions in the Baptist Church? You say they never commenced until 1816. That is what your history says. You go back of the "inventions of men" among the Waldenses. Were these "inventions" of the Waldenses the "inventions" that you heap your vituperations on our people for to-day? I say they were not. They say it is prejudicial to the mind. Is there anything prejudicial to the mind in christian societies?

Now, Dr. Watson (page 182) after referring to the scriptural text, "Other sheep I have; them also I will bring," goes on to say: "I find that the great extravagance of many who have engaged in this work has had a very bad influence on these people, and probably prevented them in some instances from performing their duty toward the 'other sheep' which may be in distant countries. And I really fear should any one profess a call of this kind, he would not receive the fellowship and assistance which he would be entitled to."

What do you say to that? Suppose one of your own denomination were to get up and tell you that he had a call for him to go to preach the gospel, and he were to ask you to send him there, what would you do? I know what you would do. You would repudiate him. You are repudiating that kind of work now, and I might use stronger language, I might say, calumniating. "Thus, I fear," goes on Watson,

"they do not act as did those who heeded all the commandments of the Lord."

I will show you that that ancient people did go out to the heathen nations, and I will show you that they were paid to go there, and that they had a financial agent to collect funds for that very purpose. I will show that the churches sent them there, one church singly, and churches combined. I will prove all of this when the time comes; I am not yet ready for it.

Now, I quote from Watson, page 418: "History teaches us that all nations which have been favored with the word of God have made far greater advances in civilization than those which have not. The history of those countries where the word of God was not known is a sad one. They were debased by all kinds of superstition and idolatry." In view of this, I ask you, brother Hardy, why your people are today heaping your vituperations on Bible societies. Dr. Watson says that those people who have received the word of God are made intelligent, more civilized and more developed than nations where the word has not been sent; and yet your people vilify Bible societies, the best means known for spreading the gospel. Your preachers say, Away with your Bible societies and Sunday classes. What are your objections to Bible societies? Do you object to people meeting together? No, but it is their work. What is their work? Their work is to publish Bibles at the cheapest possible rate. That society has published full fourteen million copies of the Bible, and employ people to sell them at five cents for the New Testament and the whole Bible for twenty-five cents. Not only that, but they are given away to men and women too poor to buy them. You are opposed to the work of such a

society! You are opposed to the free will offerings of our denomination that send contributions that enable the word of God to be sold for a mere nothing. If a copy of the Bible had to be written, what would it cost you? The material alone would cost five hundred dollars, and to employ a man to write it at twenty dollars a month that would add two hundred and forty dollars, supposing it could be done in a year. But by the work of this society this Holy Bible is possible of publication at twenty-five cents a copy all over the world. Nay, more than this. Brother Hardy himself, while condemning this society, actually preaches from a book published by it. Why? Because it can be bought for a mere nothing. But notwithstanding all this he, and his people, heap their vituperations and vilifications on us because we support such a cause. Because we support a cause that distributes the Bible, translated into many different languages, for a mere nothing, you revile and vilify us in almost every sermon you preach. And that is not all. If a man of your denomination gives a dollar to this work, you church him for it. And that is not all. Here up in Louisville there is an Orphan's Home, taking care of I don't know how many poor, fatherless and motherless little ones, feeding and clothing them, and when our brethren down here made a contribution to that institution one of your brethren made light of it. Yes, and to-day you are heaping your vituperations on us because we believe in this thing. If one of your members gives a dollar to one of these Missionary Societies you turn him out of your church, but if he spends a dollar in a grog shop to the detriment of his health and morals, so he does not get drunk, you retain him in the church.

By Elder Hardy—I object to any such manner of language.

The Moderator sustained the objection, and called the speaker to order.

Rev. Mr. Wallace resumed—I may have spoken very enthusiastically just now, but I ask the question if the statement I made is not true. I do not propose to make any statement here that is not true, and if I fail to prove what I have charged, I will cheerfully take it back. I do not wish to make any statement here that I cannot prove. I refer to Benedict (page 936): “A large amount of their documents are before me which contain the *resolutions* and decrees of their churches and associations referred to above; from these it appears that if any of their members shall unite with any society for the promotion of the cause of benevolence or moral reform, they shall, *ipso facto*, be expelled from their fellowship and communion; the missionary, Bible, tract, Sunday school and temperance societies are specially named; and generally a sweeping clause is added, embracing all the so-called benevolent institutions of the day! These prohibitions extend not only to actual membership in these bodies, but to any contributions of *their* own personal funds for their support! No collections for any of these objects can be made in any of the churches where they have the control, nor are their members allowed to cast in their mites when the box goes round in any neighboring congregation in which they may be present.”

Now, will you say I have made a false statement? I claim that I have proved my assertion. But that is nothing to what I have got on you.

By Elder Hardy—But how in regard to the whiskey matters?

By Mr. Wallace—I just remarked that a man might spend

his money in a grog shop to the annoyance of his family and the injury of his health and to the demoralization of youth, and so he did not get drunk he could remain in your church.

By Elder Hardy—I will ask you on that as to what your denomination does?

By Mr. Wallace—I know that we fail in a great many things. I told you that I was not here to defend the irregularities of our church. I know we are too slack, but while that is so, we do not heap vituperations on other denominations. My firm conviction is that Baptist Churches to-day ought to exclude every man who enters a grog shop. I have advocated that and have been vilified over and over again for it. I know that. I repeat that if I have misrepresented anybody on this point, it is not my intention; I don't want to do it. What I object to is that while our people are doing work in helping to sustain these institutions of benevolence, you are heaping your vituperations on us and them. You cannot deny that. I am satisfied that as a people you have not studied it, or you could not in the name of God and humanity stand up and take the position you do. You have first been led by your ministers, whose object it is to cry us down. In the name of God what can be the objection to the translation of the Bible into other languages. Is there a man in this house who could use the Bible in its original tongue? What could we do if it had not been translated into English? And the work that this very Bible Society is doing, you receive the benefit of.

Now, first let me say to you old anti-mission brethren, if, when I make a statement that you think is not true, you call my attention to it. If I am wrong I will make amends. Before God, I will. God knows I am not here for anything but

the truth. I am here to defend the truth, and not for a victory over my opponent. I am not here, God knows, to mislead you.

I have yet five minutes before my half hour's time is up, but it is too short to take up the line of my argument and do anything. Therefore I will leave it until to-morrow. I shall only say to you, brethren, that I have taken no exception because a statement I made has been called in question. It is due to you and it is due to me, that when I state anything that is not true that you should say so here, and not wait until my back is turned and then say I did not speak the truth.

To-morrow I will take up Coffey's History. Some of you have that book in this country, and you might just bring them along with you to-morrow morning. I like coffee generally, but this Coffey is a little too weak for me. This Coffey's History is a book that professes to give the differences between brother Hardy's denomination and mine, how the separation took place, and so on. I think it will take me all day to-morrow to treat of Coffey; the next day will be devoted to the Pedo works, and after that I will assume the burden of the argument, and answer these questions I have put to brother Hardy. He, I am sure, will not attempt to answer them.

[Here the first day's debate closed, and the audience was dismissed with the benediction, to meet to-morrow morning.]

## ELDER HARDY SAID:

[Second Day.]

[The Moderator called the meeting to order, and after prayer, read the rules governing the discussion.]

GENTLEMEN Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: I am again before you to resume this discussion, and I trust I will have your attention.

The first thing that I will notice is the remark that I made on yesterday, as the congregation knows, that brother Fulkerson was sent to Kansas to assist in the organization of a church there. For fear that what I said might have been misunderstood by the congregation, I wish to say further that I did not mean that brother Fulkerson was hired to go there; I did not mean that he was sent there by a missionary board, or anything of that description, but that the brethren in southern Illinois sent him there for the purpose I have stated, and bore his expenses, which amounted to, I think, fifty dollars.

After that explanation I will resume. The brother states in regard to the subject of atonement that it was made accessible to all the race of men. Now, I want him to come out in his next speech and tell this people whether he believes atonement was universal or special, whether Christ redeemed the race of men when he died on the cross or whether he did not. He says that his association rejects the Old Baptist baptism. I want him to tell this congregation when they did that. He says the Old Baptists, so-called, are only forty-

eight years old. I asked him yesterday, if it was not known previous to 1832, why it was when this new institution sprung up that they began at that very time to receive their baptism. He tells us now that his association did not do it. When did they refuse to do it? If there was no such a people as the Old Baptists known until 1832, I want to know what it was caused the confusion and division in the Red River Association in 1854. Now, let him answer that question.

Then he comes in on the subject of repentance. I want him to answer this one question in regard to repentance. I want to know if repentance is a voluntary act of the creature, or is it the gift of God. I would like him to answer that question.

Then he comes and accuses the Old Baptists of drinking rather too much whiskey. The Baptists have been accused of that from the days of the Apostles, and even the Apostles themselves were accused of being drunkards. For don't you know when Peter stood up that the people accused him of being drunk, and he remarked that he was not drunk? And you will remember, too, that they accused Christ of being gluttonous and a wine-bibber. Now, why do they accuse us of it? Simply because we won't organize temperance societies in our churches. Well, what use have we for such societies? Let me tell you, if the church of the Lord Jesus Christ and the law of God is not sufficient to make a sober man of a person, I want to know what will do it. What do we want with temperance societies in our churches? Is that any object of our churches? The Apostle says that the Spirit says to have temperance, and if we have the Spirit it is enough to make us temperate men. How did the Baptists get along without temperance societies away back yonder?

for the first temperance society was organized in 1824, as you can ascertain by referring to Benedict, page 674.

I say that we claim to stand right on the primitive ground of the Old Baptists; and as regards Free Masonry, I want to know whether the Baptists anciently received Free Masons into fellowship. History says they did not. These Missionary Baptists claim that they are the church of Christ simply from the fact that they send missionaries and employees through the world to preach the gospel to every creature. Well, we find that Christ called his preachers together and sent them out, and that they went, but not on the Missionary Baptist plan; their system is on a new patent. But if we claim, or if they claim, that they are right, simply from the fact that they send out missionaries, let me tell you that the Roman Catholics have the first and greatest claim to be the church of Christ.

Then, on yesterday, after reading some articles of faith, I asked the question, What was the object of the Baptists anciently in writing their articles of faith and publishing them to the world? I told you that the object was to set forth the doctrines and sentiments that they profess to believe. Brother Wallace said that I answered the question myself. Does he admit that that is the truth of the matter, that that is the object? I ask him the question now distinctly, Does he believe that was the object? Does he stand on the principle of these articles of faith to-day?

In Jones's History of the Church, on page 325, are set forth the articles of faith of the Waldenses. These articles are tolerably lengthy, and I will only have time to refer to a few clauses, such as set forth the doctrine of that people. The second clause reads:

"2. We believe that Jesus Christ is the Son and image of the Father, that in him all the fullness of the Godhead dwells, and that by him alone we know the Father. He is our Mediator and Advocate; nor is there any other name given under heaven by which we can be saved. In his name alone we call upon the Father, using no other prayers than those contained in the Holy Scriptures, or such as are in substance agreeable thereunto.

"3. We believe in the Holy Spirit as the Comforter, proceeding from the Father and from the Son; by whose inspiration we are taught to pray; being by him renewed in the spirit of our minds; who creates us anew unto good works, and from whom we receive the knowledge of the truth.

"4. We believe that there is one holy church, comprising the whole assembly of the elect and faithful, that have existed from the beginning of the world, or that shall be to the end thereof. Of this church the Lord Jesus Christ is the Head; it is governed by his word and guided by the Holy Spirit. In the church it behooves all christians to have fellowship. For her he [Christ] prays incessantly, and his prayer for it is most acceptable to God, without which indeed there could be no salvation.

\* \* \* \* \*

"10. We contend that all those in whom the fear of God dwells will thereby be led to please him, and to abound in the good works [of the gospel] which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them, which are love, joy, peace, patience, kindness, goodness, gentleness, sobriety, and the other good works enforced in the Holy Scriptures.

"11. On the other hand, we confess that we consider it to be our duty to beware of false teachers, whose object it is to

divert the minds of men from the true worship of God, and to lead them to place their confidence in the creatures, as well as to depart from the good works of the gospel, and to regard the inventions of men.

“12. We take the Old and New Testaments for the rule of our life, and we agree with the general confession of faith contained in [what is usually termed] the Apostles’ Creed.”

Now, these articles, it seems, would identify these people with the Apostles, because here is an expression of faith in accordance with theirs. Now I want to notice one clause here in particular, that is, in regard to the minister: that it is the duty of such to feed the flock of God. Did not my brother claim that I as a Baptist had departed from the truth of the Son of God? Now here are the Waldenses away back yonder, that stand up and declare that that is the duty of the preacher, to feed the flock of God.

Orchard, page 291: “Art. 25. That the church is a company of the faithful, who, having been elected before the foundation of the world, and called with a holy calling, come to unite themselves to follow the word of God, believing whatsoever he teacheth them, and living in his fear. Art. 26. And that all the elect are upheld and preserved by the power of God in such sort, that they all persevere in the faith to the end, and remain united in the holy church, as so many living members thereof.” Now, brethren, this was the faith of the Baptists in the year 1655.

Benedict, page 90. Here is a Baptist away back yonder—that was what you call an “Anabaptist” that was speaking just before his death—and these are the words he used: “O God! I entreat thee for thy grace that thou wilt not impute to me my sins, since Christ made satisfaction for them before

I was born. I was thy enemy, and thou lovedst me, accepted me in grace, and hast given for my redemption the innocent blood of thy beloved Son, although I am frequently tempted by the besetting sins of the flesh. For when "I would do good, evil was present with me." Now, does not he talk like an Old Baptist? And I say here that I believe he was one.

So now I have traced the Baptists, as I understand it, from the days of the Apostles up to the year 1544; and I am now going to show that there was a people away back yonder, and I want to show you that they were the originals, and that time rolled around and they united with the Baptists.

See Benedict, second volume, page 37; and I am now going to speak of the Separate Baptists: "The appellation of Separates first began to be given to a set of Pedobaptist reformers, whose evangelical zeal was produced by the instrumentality of the famous George Whitfield, and other eminent itinerant preachers of that day, and who began their extraordinary career about the year 1740. Soon after these reformers, who were at first called New Lights, and afterwards Separates, were organized into distinct societies, they were joined by Shubael Stearns, a native of Boston, Mass., who, becoming a preacher, labored among them until 1751, when he embraced the sentiments of the Baptists, as many others of the Pedobaptist Separates did about this time, and soon after was baptized by Rev. Wait Palmer." Now here we see that the first Baptists were called "New Lights," and that they came from the Presbyterians, and that they began about the year 1740, and they organized a church in 1757, and we see from this book that their first church was in Sandy Creek. That was the first church they had; and we find that this people soon got up great interest and revivals among them;

and we find the statement here in Benedict's second volume, page 127, that this church, the first church that they had, soon swelled from sixteen members to six hundred and six. And it appears from this, their own work, that the great increase in their members and in their denomination was after the year 1740. Now, where did these great revivals come from? They came from this spirit of the Baptists, from the Presbyterians that embraced the Baptist sentiments.

See Benedict, second volume, page 56: "At this session the Association was most painfully agitated by the discussion of the following very serious and important question, viz., 'Is salvation by Christ made possible for every individual of the human race?' This query was debated with much interest, and also with much ability; for notwithstanding the proceedings of the last meeting, by which their wisdom was so much impeached, there were at this time a number of preachers amongst the Virginia Baptists who were men of considerable reading and theological knowledge, and they, in this interesting debate, exerted all their polemical powers. Those who supported the affirmative of this question were called Arminians, while those who maintained the opposite opinion were denominated Calvinists." Thus we see from this book that at that time there was one sect of the Baptists called Arminians, and another that was called Calvinistic Baptists; and this is the position taken on the subject of the atonement, that it was accessible to every man of the human race. The query laid down here is, "Is salvation by Christ made possible for every individual of the human race?" We find that was adopted among these people, and we see that they were divided; some were Calvinists and some Arminians.

Benedict, page 61. We see from this that there had been a deviation, but that the discussion did not last but a few moments, when they united in the same association. Now we go back to the union between these people, as they are spoken of here, and the Regular Baptists. These Separate Baptists united with the Regular Baptists, and it is shown that that people united with the Regular Baptists in 1787; for on page 61 of the second volume of Benedict the following occurs: "The subject of the union between the Regulars and Separates was taken up, and after a brief and temperate discussion of their differences, a happy and effectual union was formed, and their party names dismissed and buried.

"The objection on the part of the Separates related chiefly to matters of trivial importance, such as dress, &c., and had been for some time removed, as to being a bar of communion. On the other hand, the Regulars complained that the Separates were not sufficiently explicit in their principles, having never published or sanctioned any confession of faith; and that they kept within their communion many who were professed Arminians." That was the objection, "that they kept within their communion many who were professed Arminians." "To this it was answered by the Separates that a large majority of them believed as much in their confession of faith as they did themselves." That is, that the Separates believed as much of the confession of faith of the Regular Baptists as they did themselves—that a large majority of them did; but there was a people among them according to this language that did not believe it. Now, I want to know whether there can be communion where there is no union. They claim to come in and make communion, when we see from this that there was no union. And here is the answer

of the Separate Baptists: "That if there were some among them who leaned too much to the Arminian system, they were generally men of exemplary piety and great usefulness in the Redeemer's kingdom," &c. I take it that the Regular Baptists, therefore, were the equal of the Arminians. This is where Arminianism came into our ranks; and we find that there was a fuss among the Baptists, and, following, a division. And let me tell you that these characters that came among us created the fuss among us, and when the Regular Baptists in 1787 opened their doors to receive these people, that it led to a division among the Baptists.

Now I want to read the articles of faith upon which these people were united. The History of the Kettocton Baptist Association, page 17. Here we find the articles of faith as laid down by these people, and on reading them it looks to me very much like the articles of faith of the ancient Baptists. I will begin at the fifth article.

"FIFTHLY.—That in eternity, God out of his own good pleasure chose a certain number of Adam's progeny to eternal life, and that he did not leave the accomplishment of his decrees to accident or chance, but decreed all the means to bring about the event; therefore they are chosen to salvation through sanctification of the Spirit unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ. Their calling was decreed in the purpose of election. It is said, when called, that they are called according to his purpose and grace given in Christ Jesus before the world began, and all in order to manifest the glory of his grace.

"SIXTHLY.—That the covenant of redemption was between the Father and the Son—that the elect were given by the Father to the Son, to be by him redeemed and finally saved;

and that the Son, as head and representative of his people, engaged to perform everything necessary or requisite to carry their complete salvation into effect. It is called in Scripture a well-ordered covenant in all things, and sure.

“SEVENTHLY.—That in the fullness of time the Son of God was manifested by taking human nature into union with his divine person, in which capacity he wrought out righteousness for the justification of his people; yielding a perfect and spotless obedience to all the requisitions of the divine law, and submitted himself to a shameful and ignominious death on the cross, as an atonement for their sins, and reconciliation of their souls to God.

“EIGHTHLY.—That those that are redeemed by Christ, are in due time called to a saving knowledge of the Lord Jesus Christ, embracing him as the only way to God, and Savior of poor sinners. This effectual calling is accomplished by the agency of the Holy Ghost operating in a free, irresistible and unfrustrable manner, by which the understanding is enlightened, and the will subjected to Christ. Hence the scriptures testify that they are made willing in the day of his power. The internal change, or new birth in the soul, is wholly ascribed to the power of God; for it is said of the regenerate: They are begotten of God, quickened of God, all expressive that it is the Lord's work, and he is entitled to praise.”

That strikes me very much as the way the Old Baptists used to talk, and that is the way that they talk yet. Remember these are the articles of faith upon which these people were united, and these were the articles the Regular Baptists held previous to the union. But these Arminians did not believe in them, because they believed that salvation was

made possible to every human being of the human family; the Regular Baptists did not believe that, but they believed that salvation was sure.

[The Moderators announced that the speaker's time was up.]

---

REV. MR. WALLACE SAID:

GENTLEMEN Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: I feel a little better this morning than I did last evening. I will this morning recapitulate my questions to brother Hardy.

Where did you have a separate denomination prior to 1832? How many Baptists were there in the United States in 1832? When did the separation commence? How many did you exclude from the church? What are your present numbers? How many have you in Europe? Who first brought the gospel to America? What makes the difference between America and the heathen nations? Did you ever send a missionary among any people? If so, what church and what association? As to that question you will remember what Mr. Hardy said about brother Fulkerson. However, he went back on that this morning. Did you ever have a theological school, a Bible or tract organization? Did you ever have a general association? Were we the church of Jesus Christ while we were united? Did you ever make the articles of faith a test of fellowship in your denomination? Mr. Hardy asked me awhile ago to say whether repentance was the gift of God, or not. Now, answer my question: Is the word "repent" in the active or passive voice?

I will attend to the subject of activity and passivity when I come to take up the burden of proof.

You will remember that I submitted all these questions on yesterday morning, but so far he has not touched upon one of them, and, mark me, he will not answer one of them. Another question I asked him was, What is the cause of the sinner's damnation? Is it because God is unwilling to save him? Was there a portion of the human family reprobated from eternity? I hold these questions open for brother Hardy to answer until to-morrow at noon, when I will assume the burden of proof, and so perform a work of supererogation. Brother Hardy, as I have predicted already, will not attempt to answer these questions, because, first, he *cannot* answer them, and, secondly, he will not, because they are diametrically opposed to his doctrine.

Well, he has proved missionary operations in the case of brother Fulkerson. It would seem a number of brethren in Kansas wanted to organize a church, and they sent down to the brethren in Illinois to assist them, and they sent brother Fulkerson and felt disposed to pay his expenses. Now, I see before me Presbyterians and Methodists that believe in missionary operations, and I ask them if that is the kind of missionary work they do? Missionary Baptists know something about missionary work; did they ever call such as that missionary work? Oh, says my brother Hardy, this morning, he was not hired to go. Yesterday you said he was a missionary, and a missionary, you say, is hired. Oh, no, you say now, old brother Fulkerson's expenses were paid and that was all! Well, if a man has his expenses paid, he don't care if he is hired, or not; so he is well fed and clothed.

When did our association pass a resolution to exclude your

baptism? I believe it was two years ago, he says. Did not I prove by Benedict that it was years ago? I told you yesterday that I did not propose to defend the irregularities in our churches; I know that there are such things in them. The Apostle Paul never defended the irregularities of the church then, and I do not propose to do it now. The human family is imperfect, and the best of us will violate rules now and then.

Mr. Hardy says that I prefer Watson to the Bible. Well, wait until I get to the Bible; I am not yet ready to come to that. They talk about the increase of the Baptist Church! I will show you a greater increase in the days of the Apostles than has ever been known since. I will show you mission operations in the Bible. I will show you where the church sent out missionaries, and I will show you the points they were sent to. I will show you from the Bible where the Church sent their financial agent to collect money. Wait until I come to it.

But, history! says brother Hardy. And yet he has quoted from nothing but Missionary Baptist works. Mosheim, for instance, was a Lutheran, and consequently I am not indebted to him. Mr. Hardy says that *I* made the charge that they had departed from their principles. Did not your own brother, Dr. Watson, make it? Why not fall your timber on him? Don't you know your brother Watson was a truthful man? Does not everybody know that I quoted the charge from Dr. Watson, and is it necessary for me to recapitulate that? There are men here, observing men, who know that I quoted from Dr. Watson where he charges these people with reprehensive neglect, and departure from primitive ways. You may renounce Dr. Watson now, but I say a smarter

man you never had, and you will never have such another. Or, if you do, you will have to get out of your old grooves, and prejudice against theological institutions, for he was a graduate of one of them.

Well, I told you yesterday that I would refer to Coffey. Brother Fulkerson is the indorser of the book, and he will certainly not object to taking Coffey now. I will first read brother Fulkerson's indorsement: "Having examined the manuscript, I, with all my heart, recommend this little volume to the Regular Baptists and to all inquirers after truth." Mr. Thomas J. Carr, another Regular Baptist, writes an appendix, in which he also tells the same thing and indorses the work, but I will not read it.

Now, Coffey, in quoting from Ray's History, says, "According to Elder S. Trott there was no body of Baptists in the world calling themselves Old School, prior to the year 1832." That is what their own writer says. He acknowledges the fact. I told you I would prove my statement by their own people; and here we have it acknowledged by their own writers.

Coffey, page 14: "We will notice these 'historic facts and documents.' The historian's 'appeal' is to the statement of three men, from which he infers that they admit that the secession was on the part of the Regulars, or Hard-shells. We will here give the statements, in order, of the three men just alluded to: 'Elder. S. Trott, an Old School Baptist of distinction, says of the separation: This brought brethren, churches and associations that had been groaning under burdens of human inventions and impositions in religion, to separate themselves, some sooner and some later, from the whole mass of the popular religion and religionists, and to take a

stand as a distinct people upon the *Old Baptist standard*. The holding of the scriptures as the *only and a perfect rule of faith and practice*, and Christ as the Foundation, the Head and Life of the church, the only source and medium of salvation. This separation occasioned the splitting of several associations and many churches. We took, as a distinguishing appellation, the name, Old School Baptists.'

"The above is one of the 'historic facts' to which Mr. Ray appeals in order to prove the priority of the Missionaries. Surely he must be sorely pressed for testimony, that he would strain the language and misconstrue the meaning of Elder Trott's statement, in order to establish his position, while the proper interpretation goes to confirm the fact that the Old Baptists applied the sacred rule and withdrew from them that walked disorderly."

Now, I want brother Hardy to answer as to whether we were the church of Christ when we were united? He certainly ought to be able to answer that question, inasmuch as he is a man who claims to have read history a great deal. Why does not he come up to the point?

Page 16: "The Regular Baptists have ever regarded the inventions of men in the affairs of religion an unspeakable abomination before God; and it has always been their custom to withdraw from any disorder, either in doctrine or practice. The 'element of heresy' alluded to by Dr. Watson, was doubtless the doctrine of nonresurrection, and they withdrew from that disorder as well as the modern missionary heresy." Now, the question arises, had Coffey ever seen Watson's book? If he never did, what right had he to say what Watson had referred to? If he had ever seen the book,

I will show you that Coffey made a statement that he knew was untrue. Now, is not that the way to get at it?

On page 25 of Ray's History the following passage occurs: "Dr. John M. Watson says: 'After our painful separation from the Missionaries in 1836, a number of churches in the bounds of the Old Concord Association met together and formed the *Stone River Association*. We had then, as was generally supposed, a strong and happy union; but, alas! there was an element of heresy incorporated in that body as bad, if not worse, than that from which we had just withdrawn.' In the above Dr. Watson admits that the 'Old Baptists' separated and *withdrew* from the 'Missionaries.' It is admitted that, in some cases, the anti-mission brethren had the majority in churches, and even in some associations; but as a body they were largely in the minority; only a fraction, when the separation occurred. Elder Jeter says of these Baptists: 'The class of Baptists described in the above extract were called, in some places, Old School, and in others, from the name of the place at which they held their seceding convention, Black Rock Baptists. They separated themselves from the Regular Baptists about the time of the rise of Mr. Campbell's Reformation.' And Elder Beebe, of New York, the anti-mission editor, admits, in substance, the truth of the above position, that the 'Old School' Baptists seceded or withdrew from the 'Missionary' Baptists."

Now, Coffey comes up and says that Watson, without a doubt, had reference to nonresurrectionism; and I say if he had ever seen Watson's book, then he made a statement he knew to be untrue; and if he never had seen it, why did he put any such language as that into his work? And brother Fulkerson indorses this work, having seen the manuscript of

it, as full of truth, and recommends it to the brethren and all inquirers after truth. Now, this I know is bad coffee, but hold your nose and drink.

Now, turn to Coffey, page 20, which is a letter from the editor of the *Signs of the Times*, Elder Beebe, to brother Thomas J. Carr.

“BROTHER CARR.—When I became a member of the Baptist Church in 1811 no religious institution was known or patronized to my knowledge, in connection with the Baptists of the United States.”

This is the statement of one of the leading men of your denomination to Mr. Carr a few years ago. I believe that Mr. Carr lives in brother Fulkerson's neighborhood; and when they got up this work, I suppose they got this statement from Mr. Beebe after calling his attention to what Mr. Ray says. And this is his reply to them, that when he joined their church in 1811 no such thing as they spoke of existed. Yet this book is recommended to all inquirers after truth! if a man wants to find the truth, brother Fulkerson says that he can get it from this work.

I will now quote from Benedict, page 453: “At that time Rev. Dr. James Manning was officiating as President of Rhode Island College, which had been commenced in 1765, under his direction, at Warren. It was for several years a matter of doubt where the college would be permanently established, but in 1770, it was determined by the corporation, that the college edifice ‘be built in the town of Providence, and there be continued forever.’ The removal of Dr. Manning to this town was hailed by the church as a happy event, supposing, as they did, that by calling him to be their minister they would carry into effect Mr. Windsor's wishes.

Immediately on his arrival he was requested to occupy the pulpit, and as the first Sabbath on which he preached happened to be the day for administering the Lord's supper, he was invited by Mr. Windsor to participate with the church. Soon after that, suspicion seems to have arisen among some, that Dr. Manning held the imposition of hands rather too loosely, and that he practiced it more to accommodate the consciences of others, than to meet the demands of his own. A party of these was soon formed, with whom Mr. Windsor himself sympathized and acted. Still it was thought by some that this was only 'the ostensible reason' of their dissatisfaction, and that they must have some other one more weighty. This was found in the opposition of Mr. Windsor to the introduction of music in public worship, which it was supposed Dr. Manning favored. On that point the sentiments of the Quakers seem to have prevailed, and singing was discarded, as unauthorized by the New Testament. What diversity of opinion once existed touching a point which seems clear to us, may be inferred from the fact, that in 1691, a work was published in London, by the celebrated Keach, entitled, 'The Breach Repaired in God's worship; or the singing of psalms, hymns and spiritual songs, proved to be a holy ordinance of Jesus Christ.' In this the author proceeded to show what it is to sing, that there can be no proper singing without the voice, that the essence of singing is no more in the heart or spirit than the essence of preaching, and to elucidate other points connected with the subject. It is probable that singing was first laid aside in times of persecution, on account of the danger of practicing it, and afterwards it was difficult to revive everywhere a due sense of its worth as a divine appointment. In regard to this the teaching of

the New Testament seems to us to be quite explicit, and that the church is left to select her own songs and modes of singing; yet it is worthy of note, that among the Scotch Presbyterians there has been more objection to the introduction of metrical hymns, than there ever was in this place to the introduction of sacred music into worship. Such discussions may seem fastidious now, but it must be remembered that after Popery had long made void God's word by man's tradition, the spirit which produced a reformation would be naturally characterized by an extreme and sensitive jealousy, on every practice on which the seal of divine authority was not clearly seen. On this latter point Mr. Windsor strongly insists in his letter to the church touching the controversy before us, though the stress of his argument is applied to the doctrine of laying on of hands. After a series of church meetings, the whole matter was decided in favor of Dr. Manning, who thence became the pastor of this church, while Mr. Windsor afterwards became the founder of a new church in Johnston, which exists to this day."

We have seen by Mr. Beebe's statement that he joined the church in 1811, and says that such a thing as this did not exist among the Baptists at that time, but here we find that this college was constituted in the year 1765. My brother has been quoting from Benedict himself. Now, after this, I wonder whether he will go back of him. How do you like coffee of that kind?

Now I will turn to Benedict, page 594; and I may say here, that I will hereafter give the reason why it is that he makes this statement: "The first school 'for the education of youth for the ministry,' among the American Baptists, was begun at Hopewell, in this State, by Rev. Isaac Eaton, a distin-

guished minister of his day. This school was opened in 1756, and continued eleven years. Towards the support of it a fund of £400 was raised by the Philadelphia Association, which was mostly annihilated by the ravages of continental money. Among the ministers who received the rudiments of their education at this academy were J. Manning, S. Jones, H. Smith, I. Spillman, D. Thomas, J. Davis, W. Williams, R. Keith, C. Thompson, D. Jones, J. Sutton, D. Sutton, J. Talbot, J. Blackwell, J. Powell, W. Worth, L. Bonnell." Now, here we have the statement made that this college was founded in 1756, and it has stood until this day. 1756—long before Mr. Beebe joined the church, and he is one of their leading men. Now I will show you the reason for this statement, and I will show you that these representations are just; and don't you hear them asserted from the pulpit every Sunday whenever they preach throughout this country?

Now I will quote from page 707: "In 1755 the Association, taking into consideration the destitute condition of many places in the interior settlements of this and the neighboring States (then Provinces), recommended to the churches to make contributions for the support of a missionary, to itinerate in those parts. Mr. Hart was authorized and requested, provided a sufficient sum could be raised, to procure, if possible, a suitable person for the purpose. With this view he visited Pennsylvania and New Jersey in the following year, and prevailed with Rev. John Gano to undertake the service, who attended the annual meeting, and was cordially received. The Association requested Mr. Gano to visit the Yadkin settlement, in North Carolina, first, and afterwards to bestow his labors wherever Providence should appear to direct." Now, here it is shown that in the year 1755 the Philadelphia

Association sent out a missionary into the destitute places in the country; and yet Mr. Beebe says that no such thing existed in the year 1811, when he joined the church. And, as I said before, Mr. Beebe is one of your leading men. Doubtless this is very good coffee.

Now I will turn to page 708 of Benedict: "The following year he received from the Association a letter of thanks for his faithfulness and industry in the mission. At the same time the expediency of raising a fund to furnish suitable candidates for the ministry, with a competent share of learning, was taken into consideration, and it was recommended to the churches generally to collect money for the purpose. The members present engaged in behalf of their constituents to furnish £133 to begin the fund, and Messrs. Stephens, Hart and Pelot were chosen trustees. In 1759 Mr. Evan Pugh was proposed, by Mr. Gano, as a candidate for the ministry. He was examined, approved, and put on a course of studies. Having gone through them, he preached before the Association in 1762, with acceptance, and was soon after ordained." Here you have a candidate ordained from this very college in 1762, and had preached before your Association, and yet Mr. Beebe says that no such thing existed at that time. I guess this is a kind of coffee that you are not going to use.

Benedict, page 709: "The Association has now existed ninety-six years, and during this long period it has been uniform in its principles and pursuits, having been under the management of men of intelligence and stability. Among its earlier doings it paid special attention to the cause of missions, ministerial education, and all benevolent institutions then patronized and promoted by evangelical christians.

"So deeply were they imbued with the spirit of missions,

that almost a hundred years since they sent more than a thousand miles for the Rev. John Gano, to become their missionary in destitute parts of their own State, and of North Carolina. He was appointed and supported in the same manner as missionaries are at the present time."

Now, then, after this, claim that you are identified with the ancient Baptists. Here we have them sending for Gano a distance of a thousand miles, and he was supported in the same manner as missionaries are at the present time; and yet Mr. Beebe asserts that there was no such thing as a missionary at the time he joined the church in 1811, and Mr. Coffey indorses Mr. Beebe! You will find that on page 25, which I will not take time to read; but I will quote from page 43 of Coffey's work: "The first Association that adopted it in the United States was the Philadelphia Association; they, at their meeting in 1816, appointed Luther Rice to proceed to the West to enlist the Associations in that part of the country in their cause." Here your author says that the first time that such a thing was known in the United States was in the year 1816. I have shown from the quotations that I have made that it existed long prior to that time, and I think I have proved it to the satisfaction of the people here. Now, if you will read the biography of Luther Rice, you will find that he was ordained in 1812; not that he commenced the work at that time, but that he was ordained and sent out at that time. But Mr. Coffey says that that was in the year 1816, four years after the time stated in the biography of Rice. When this book was first published I happened to pick it up, and inadvertently opened it at page 53, where the parallel line is drawn, showing on one side "the true gospel," and on the other side "the missionary gospel," and this is it:

“THE TRUE GOSPEL AND THE MISSIONARY GOSPEL.

“Behold, I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me.—*David*.

“All scripture is given by inspiration of God.—*Paul*.

“Elect according to the foreknowledge of God.—*Peter*.

“For the gifts and calling of God are without repentance.—*Paul*.

“It is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that sheweth mercy.—*Paul*.

“Of his own will begat he us with the word of truth.—*James*.

“No man can come unto me except the Father, which hath sent me, draw him.—*Jesus*.

“If any man lack wisdom, let him ask of God.—*James*.

“Take the oversight thereof; not for filthy lucre.—*Peter*.

“Take neither purse, nor scrip, nor two coats.—*Jesus*.

“Verily, verily I say unto you, Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God.—*Jesus*.”

“All men are born pure and holy.

“We need a new revision.

“No man is elected until he repents and believes.

“There are no gifts and calling of God until you repent.

“It is of him that willeth, and of him that runneth, that he may obtain mercy.

“Of our own will we embraced religion.

“All may come, if they will, and obtain religion.

“Must send them to college to learn them to preach.

“I will preach for \$500 a year.

“Take all the purses and scrip you can collect.

“Except a man use the means in his power, in order that he may be born again, he cannot be saved.”

Now, I ask you all here if you ever heard a Missionary Baptist preach such as is put down here. I say to brother Hardy, that if any of his people ever heard a Missionary Baptist preach this as it is here, I want that man's name and his post-office address. I speak to this whole congregation: Methodists, Presbyterians, Missionary Baptists, or anybody. Have you ever heard a Missionary Baptist preach such as

this in your lives? If you have, give me the man's name and his post-office address, and I will communicate with him. I denounce it as false in every particular; as false a statement as was ever invented.

[One of the audience here rose in his seat and said that Dr. C. C. Chaplin, of Austin, Texas, preached that very thing in Paducah, Kentucky.]

Mr. Wallace said—I am very well acquainted with him, and I am willing to stand by what he says. I am certain that Dr. Chaplin never made any such statement, and I say now that I will address him on this subject. It is the first time that I ever heard of such a thing being preached. I know that it is not Missionary Baptist doctrine. I repeat now that I will address Dr. Chaplin on the subject, and if he ever preached such a thing, he is one of the most ignorant men in our denomination.

[The Moderators here announced that the speaker's time had expired.]

---

#### ELDER HARDY SAID:

GENTLEMEN Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: I will notice a few things that Mr. Wallace has stated in regard to his people refusing to receive our baptism. It seems that they received our baptism for forty-six years, and never knew that it was wrong until two years ago, when they passed an act in their Association saying that they would no longer do it. Now, in the first place, what made them think that it was right? It seems to me that with all their colleges and

learning and talent they ought to have found that it was wrong long previous to that time.

Mr. Wallace tries to prove that his people are certainly the original Baptists, simply from the fact that they had a college away back in 1764. If the Baptists previous to 1764 did not have them, I want to know if we are not on the original ground in place of them. The first college that he can show among the Baptists was in 1764.

Now, I want to read from Cramp, page 547: "The government of the college is vested in a Board of Fellows, consisting of twelve members, of whom eight, including the president, must be Baptists, and a Board of Trustees, consisting of thirty-six members, of whom twenty-two must be Baptists, five Friends or Quakers, four Congregationalists, and five Episcopalians. These represent the different denominations existing in the state when the charter was obtained. The instruction and immediate government of the college rests in the president and Board of Fellows."

Now, we see from this that that college did not belong to the Baptists exclusively. As a denomination the Baptists had no such thing as this belonging to them.

I will now refer to Benedict, page 810:

"LITERARY INSTITUTIONS.—Hitherto our people have had nothing of the kind which they could call their own, of much permanency or efficiency. Late reports exhibit a commendable degree of zeal and liberality in favor of a projected seminary of the liberal class, to be called The Union University, to be located at Murfreesborough."

Here it is shown that this is the first thing of the kind that the Baptists had, and this was organized in the year 1840.

But enough of colleges. If Mr. Wallace can prove that the

Baptists had a thousand colleges in 1764 or 1765 or 1766, what would that amount to? The question is: Did the Baptists in ancient days have such things in their order, institutions to manufacture preachers? I say distinctly that they did not have them.

Then, Mr. Wallace comes in with his missionaries and says that he is going to prove that they were known and used by the church away back yonder in the days of the Apostles. Now as to these people I have shown from quotation already made that the great increase in their denomination was in the year 1740.

I take the position here, and I am going to prove it, that the first Missionary Society the Missionaries ever had was organized in the year 1792, and I do not think Mr. Wallace will dispute my authority. I refer to Benedict's first volume, pages 234, 5, 6 and 7: "This mission originated in England, and is supported and directed by a society, which was formed about twenty years ago, by the Baptists in that kingdom. An interesting account of this important establishment was not long since published in a small volume by Dr. Staughton, of Philadelphia, under the title of the Baptist mission in India, containing a narrative of its rise, progress, and present condition. Very interesting communications from the Missionaries in India are also frequently inserted in the Baptist Magazine, edited by Dr. Baldwin, of Boston. But for the benefit of those of our brethren who have not had access to these sources of information, I shall here give a brief account of this noble institution.

"As early as 1784, it was resolved by an association held at Nottingham, in England, to set apart an hour the first Monday evening in every month, for extraordinary prayer

for the revival of religion, and for the extending of Christ's kingdom in the world. This was three years before Mr. Carey was ordained. This distinguished man from his first entering on the work of the ministry, directed all his thoughts, plans and studies towards enterprises of a missionary kind. In 1790 he visited Birmingham and became acquainted with the late Samuel Pearce, whose kindred soul entered with ardor into all his views. Others at the same time were animated with a missionary zeal, and in 1702 the society was formed at Kettering, which has since, by its wonderful acts, astonished the christian world."

MINUTES OF THE PHILADELPHIA BAPTIST ASSOCIATION FROM A. D. 1707 TO 1807.—(page 430): "Patronized by christians in Scotland and in America, Elliott, Brainerd, Edwards, and others labored among the aborigines of the country; but it was not until about the year 1790 that the great missionary spirit, which now exists, began to diffuse itself. On the mind of our brother Carey, and of several brethren of the Northamptonshire Baptist Association in England, the case of the benighted Pagans lay with weight. Prayer meetings for the spread of the gospel were established, and a pamphlet was composed and published by brother Carey, stating and enforcing the obligations of christians to exert themselves for the conversion of the heathen. The holy flame spread until in the year 1792 the Baptist Missionary Society was formed. Bengal was determined upon as the seat of the mission, and our brethren Carey and Thomas were sent thither."

Then, see "Life and Death of Rev. Andrew Fuller," page 139: "A resolution was printed in this year's Letter 'That a plan be prepared against the next ministers' meeting at

Kettering for forming a Baptist Society for Propagating the Gospel among the Heathen.' Brother Carey generously engaged to devote all the profits that might arise from his late publications on this interesting subject to the use of such a society. This society was actually formed in Mrs. Beeby Wallis's back parlor, on October 2, 1792, as all the friends of the Baptist Mission know."

Now, brother Wallace, are you a friend of the Baptist mission? This writer says they all know it, and if you are a "friend," and they all know it, then you know it. Here I have established the fact by three witnesses that the first missionary society was formed in 1792, and if the Baptists had nothing of this nature previous to that time, I ask this intelligent congregation if that was not a departure from Baptist usage. Mr. Wallace cries out that we are opposed to missionism. I say we are not opposed to it on the plan of the Bible, but we are opposed to missionary societies on the new patent plan. But I do not think it is worth while to argue any longer on the subject of missionism and Bible societies, and I will now turn to another point.

It is generally understood that the Baptists claim that Roger Williams was the founder of the first church in America, but I propose to show here the foundation and existence of a church previous to that of Williams's. Mr. Wallace claims that he has broken my chain of succession; I could break his line of baptism, simply from the fact that Roger Williams was baptized by a lay member.

However, to go back to the first church established. Cox's History (page 530): "Dr. Clark was then the founder of the first Baptist church in America, at Newport, in 1638."

Now, the church set up by Williams was set up in 1639,

but by the above quotation we discover a church founded a year previous to that time. And as to this church established by Williams we learn from history that it soon became extinguished, for says this author (same page): "Mr. Benedict thinks he (Williams) remained pastor of the little church four years, and then joined the Quakers;" and this church, says history, soon went out of existence. But even as to that, let me say we are not dependent on either of these, because there were a number of Baptists that came from the old country here as organized churches, notably a Welch church that was organized in 1701 in Wales and came to America as an organized church; and that church stands to-day, and it stands on the very principle on which it was organized. And I take the position that it stands on the very same principles that it has ever stood, and that church is the Regular Baptists of this day. So we see the first church in America did not originate with Roger Williams. The first association in America was organized in 1701, and the Missionary Baptists claim this as a Missionary Baptist Association. However, I have got the history of that association here; and, as we want to decide this matter and ascertain what doctrine they teach, whether they preach the doctrine of the Missionary Baptists or that of the Regular Baptists, I will refer to it. The confession of faith that people adopted away back yonder was written out by the Baptists in Wales in 1689. (Belcher, 141.)

"3. GOD'S DECREE.—Those of mankind who are predestined to life, God, before the foundation of the world was laid, according to his eternal and immutable purpose, and the secret counsel and good pleasure of his will, hath chosen in Christ unto everlasting glory, out of his mere free grace

and love; without any other thing in the creature as a condition or cause moving him thereunto.

“As God hath appointed the elect unto glory, so he hath by the eternal and most free purpose of his will, foreordained all the means thereunto; wherefore they who are elected, being fallen in Adam, are redeemed by Christ, are effectually called unto faith in Christ, by his Spirit working in due season, are justified, adopted, sanctified, and kept by his power through faith unto salvation.—Eph. i. 4, 5, 11; John xiii. 18; Rom. viii. 29, 30; Eph. ii. 8; 2d Thess. ii. 13; John xvii. 17, 19.

“4. THE FALL OF MAN, AND SIN.—Although God created man upright and perfect, and gave to him a righteous law, yet he did not long abide in this honor, but did willfully transgress the command given unto him, in eating the forbidden fruit; which God was pleased, according to his wise and holy counsel, to permit, having purposed to order it to his own glory. Our first parents, by this sin, fell from their original righteousness and communion with God, whereby death came upon all; all becoming dead in sin, and wholly defiled in all the faculties and parts of soul and body. They being the root, corrupted nature was conveyed to all their posterity, descending from them by ordinary generation, being now conceived in sin, and by nature children of wrath.—Gen. ii. 16, 17; Gen. iii. 11, 12, 13; Rom. v. 12–14; Jer. xvii. 9; Psal. li. 5; Eph. ii. 3.

“5. GOD’S COVENANT.—Man having brought himself under the curse of the law by his fall, it pleased the Lord to reveal the covenant of grace, wherein he freely offereth unto sinners life and salvation by Jesus Christ, requiring of them faith in him, that they might be saved, and promising to give unto all those that are ordained unto eternal life his Holy

Spirit, to make them willing and able to believe.—Gal. iii. 10; John iii. 15, 16.

“6. CHRIST AS THE MEDIATOR.—The Son of God, the second person in the Holy Trinity, being very and eternal God, the brightness of the Father’s glory, of one substance and equal with him, who made the world, who upholdeth and governeth all things he hath made, did, when the fullness of time was come, take upon him man’s nature, with all the essential properties and common infirmities thereof, yet without sin; so that two whole, perfect and distinct natures were inseparably joined together in one person, which person is very God and very man, yet one Christ, the only Mediator between God and man.—John i. 14; Gal. iv. 4; Rom. viii. 3; Heb. iv. 15; 1st Tim. ii. 5.

“7. REDEMPTION.—The Lord Jesus Christ, by his perfect obedience and sacrifice of himself, which he through the eternal Spirit once offered up unto God, hath fully satisfied the justice of God, procured reconciliation, and purchased an everlasting inheritance in the kingdom of heaven for all those whom the Father hath given unto him.

“To all those for whom Christ hath obtained eternal redemption, he doth certainly and effectually apply and communicate the same, making intercession for them, uniting them to himself by his Spirit, revealing unto them in and by the word the mystery of salvation, persuading them to believe and obey, governing their hearts by his word and Spirit, overcoming all their enemies by his almighty power and wisdom, in such manner and ways as are most consonant to his wonderful and unsearchable dispensation, and all of free and absolute grace, without any condition foreseen in them to procure it.—Heb. x. 14; Rom. iii. 25, 26; John xvii. 2; Heb.

ix. 15; John vii. 37; John xvii. 9; Rom. viii. 9, 14; 1 Cor. xv. 25, 26; John iii. 8.

"8. **THE WILL.**—Man, by his fall into a state of sin, hath wholly lost all will to any spiritual good accompanying salvation; so a natural man, being altogether averse from that good, and dead in sin, is not able by his own strength to convert himself, or to prepare himself thereunto.

"When God converts a sinner and translates him into the state of grace, he freeth him from his natural bondage under sin, and by his grace alone enables him freely to will and do that which is spiritually good.—Rom. viii. 7, 8; John vi. 44; Col. i. 13, 14; John viii. 36; Rom. viii. 2; Eph. ii. 8; 2d Tim. i. 9.

"9. **EFFECTUAL CALLING.**—Those whom God hath predestinated unto life, he is pleased in his appointed and accepted time effectually to call by his word and Spirit, out of the state of sin and death in which they are by nature, to grace of salvation by Jesus Christ.—Rom. viii. 30; 2d Thess. ii. 13, 14; Eph. i. 4, 5.

"10. **JUSTIFICATION.**—Those whom God effectually calleth, he also freely justifieth, accounting and accepting their persons as righteous; not for anything wrought in them or done by them, but for Christ's sake alone.—Rom. iii. 24; viii. 30; v. 17-19.

"11. **ADOPTION.**—All those that are justified, God vouchsafed in and for the sake of his only Son, Jesus Christ, to make partakers of the grace of adoption, by which they are taken into the number and enjoy the liberties and privileges of the children of God.—Eph. i. 5; Gal. iv. 5, 6; Eph. ii. 19; Rom. viii. 15.

"12. They who are united to Christ, effectually called and

regenerated, having a new heart and a new spirit created in them, through the virtue of Christ's death and resurrection, are also further sanctified, really and personally, through the same virtue, by his word and Spirit dwelling in them.—John xviii. 17-19; Eph. iii. 16-19."

Now, here are the articles of faith adopted by the founders of the church in Wales in the year 1689, as we find by the title to them on page 141 of Belcher's "Religious Denominations;" and these were adopted by the Philadelphia Baptist Association in 1742. Brother Wallace has complained that I asked the question and then answered it as to the object of these people in writing their articles of faith. I said that it was done simply because they wanted to set forth the doctrine by which they professed to be governed. Now, I want to know if Mr. Wallace will come up here and admit that these articles of faith are in harmony with the doctrine of the Missionary Baptists of to-day—if they contain what the Missionary Baptists of to-day believe. These people, it seems, believe that the salvation of the sinner belongs to the Lord Jesus Christ—that he does all the work; and that is what the Bible teaches. The Bible says that he saved us of his holy calling, and that it is not according to our works, but according to his own grace that was given to us before the world began. And do not these articles of faith set forth the same doctrine? Do they not set forth the doctrine that the Regular Baptists believe to-day? Did you ever hear a Regular Baptist preach anything contrary to what is contained in them? I say, Mr. Wallace, you never did in your life.

MINUTES OF THE PHILADELPHIA BAPTIST ASSOCIATION.—

(Here is a query that came before the Association in the year

1753.) Page 68: "Query from the church at Kingwood: 'Whether a person denying unconditional election, [these people believed the doctrine of unconditional election, and I want you to notice the query, if you please] the doctrine of original sin, and the final perseverance of the saints, and striving to affect as many as he can, may have full communion with the church?'

"Answer: That the very consequence of it opposeth the absolute sovereignty of God over his own creatures contrary to express Scriptures, which to declare and fully prove, the three parts denied by said questionist.

"1st. That personal election is the truth of God."

That is what they said; and did not brother Wallace come up and make sport of this people on yesterday because we believe its doctrine? "That personal election is the truth of God, (Eph. i. 5; Matt. xxiv. 24); and our infallible hope is proved by John x. 28; as also the saints' perseverance, verse 29, and John xvii. 6; they are the gift of the Father to his Son, Jesus Christ, who will, and is able to, keep them and secure their happiness.—John xvii. 24; Acts xiii. 48. The foundation of God standeth sure, whatever becomes of the presumptuous counsels of obstinate men.—2d Thess. ii. 13; Titus i. 1; 1st Peter i. 2-5.

"That we are originally sinful, or partakers of the first sin of human nature, being all included in Adam when he was created, and partakers of that happiness with which he was indued, as his rightful heir; but he, forgetting that great favor bestowed freely upon him and his posterity, we, as well as himself, are justly shut out of our native happiness, and have lost our right thereunto forever, unless our title be restored by the second Adam, the Lord from heaven, by being

effectually called in time.—Eph. ii. 12, 13; Rom. v. 12 to the end; Eccl. vii. 2. Upon which fundamental doctrines of christianity, next to the belief of an eternal God, our faith must rest; and we adopt, and would that all the churches belonging to the Association be well grounded in accordance to our Confession of Faith and Catechism, and cannot allow that any are true members of our churches who deny the said principles, be their conversation outward what it will.” Here we are told that if they deny the doctrine of personal election, it makes no difference what their outward talk may be, they would not be received as members of the church. And I say that we do the same things. Brother Wallace would not be received, because he does not believe that.

Now turn to page 128 of the same volume: “This year the association met at Philadelphia, October 12th, and began at three o’clock, P. M., as usual, with divine service. The sermon by our brother, Rev. Morgan Edwards, from Numbers xxiii. 9; who, after observing, that ‘standing alone and unreckoned among the nations’ meant a religious ‘singularity;’ and comparing his text with the King of Moab’s sense of it, chap. xxiv. 10, advanced this doctrinal point and exemplified it in the case of the Baptists from the beginning of christianity to the present time. ‘Standing alone and unnumbered with any religious society.’” This year referred to, as we find by the title, was 1773. These Baptists up to that time stood alone and unnumbered with any religious society. These people had no such things among them, as Mr. Wallace has strived to prove, in the year 1773; they had no such thing as a religious society, and nothing to train up the children and to teach them religion; but, no doubt, they brought them up in the fear and admonition of the Lord.

[The Moderators announced that the speaker’s time was up.]

REV. MR. WALLACE SAID:

GENTLEMEN Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: I feel still better, I improve as I get along.

First, as to what brother Hardy said as to its being only two years ago since a thing was known among Baptists as prescription against baptism. I will quote from Benedict, page 943: "I have ascertained by my extensive correspondence, that by far the greatest part of our denomination both rebaptize and reordain all who join them, from whatever churches they come."

Now, that is from Benedict, over fifty years ago, and he was then speaking of the Baptists of the United States, and this is in reference to the question of the increase in our denomination.

Brother Hardy next takes up the question as to where and when missionism first commenced. That is something that I will attend to, without any help from Mr. Hardy. Why does not he dispute what Beebe says? "Here, now, he says, in 1791," which means nineteen years before Beebe joined the church, and forty years before you had an existence, because you cannot show a separate denomination prior to the year 1832. Why does not Mr. Hardy come up to this point?

I asked him to answer the question whether articles of faith had ever been made a test of fellowship in his denomination, or not. He has failed to answer the question, and I will show you after awhile why he has failed. Let him spend his whole

strength on the articles of faith, if he wants to. I will attend to that point in due time.

He says that many Baptists claim Roger Williams as the founder of the church. Why, Mr. Hardy claimed that himself when we had the discussion over in Livingston County. Now, however, he claims that the first church was at Newport under John Clark, and he says that that is a Regular Baptist church to-day. Well, I am not going to dispute that. You know it is a Regular Baptist church, and you know that that church is now supporting missionary operations; and that church belongs to us, and never belonged to anybody else.

And that is not all. I will show you churches that never had a split in them in this country; I will cite to you whole states that never had any trouble in their churches and never knew anything about antissionism only as they found it recorded in history. I will show you how these troubles arose, where it did. One of the charges made by Mr. Hardy's people was that the Missionary Baptists were in alliance with the Abolitionists of the North. It was charged that all they wanted was to get the reins of the government in their hands, and the Baptists were warned against these Missionary Baptists. I don't think Mr. Hardy will call that statement in question.

Next. Mr. Hardy said I made sport of the doctrine of election. Who heard that? I had something to say about his "eternal election," it is true. Now, I believe in the doctrine of election by the foreknowledge of God as much as any man; there is no man on earth that believes it more than I do, but this "eternal" arrangement, I do not believe. I believe in election, as do all my brethren, so far as the fore-

knowledge and purpose of God is concerned; and we have never denied it. And that is not all. I will show you that God made a choice of means to bring about that election; that he ordained the gospel as one of the primary means. Mr. Hardy and his people deny that. I say I will show you that Baptists anciently said it was a means to bring in the elect of God. Mr. Hardy has called on his God to witness that he did not believe in means. He says further that I cannot get in his church. I say I can get in on anything. I can get in on apostasy and infant baptism. I know they will require an explanation of this. I have asked Mr. Hardy to say whether articles of faith have ever been made a test of fellowship in his denomination. Whenever he comes up in answer to this, I will prove what I have said. I told you yesterday that if I made any statement before this people that I could not prove, I would emphatically take it back. Now, this is reasonable, is it not?

Now, we will have some more Coffey (page 53): On this "The True Gospel" side is the quotation from Paul, "All scripture is given by inspiration of God;" and opposite to it on the "Missionary Gospel" side, "We need a new revision." Now, I wonder if brother Hardy knows anything of our revision of the Bible; if he does, he has learned it since we had our discussion over in Livingston County. I want to ask him whether he accepts the present translation. If he does, he cannot identify himself with the primitive Baptists, for at the time King James's translation was brought out, the Baptists protested against it. It was not your people, Mr. Hardy, that translated this Bible; you could not translate it, because you have not got a man in your denomination capable of doing it. You talk a great deal about the amount of the-

ology you preach in your denomination, but combine you all together and you cannot translate the Bible from the Greek language into its present translation. You just cannot do it; you have not the talent among you.

King James was the head of the church, and in 1611 he appointed a commission of Episcopalians to translate the Bible; the Baptists had nothing to do with it. It was translated in the interest of the Episcopal Church, and King James superintended it himself; consequently the Baptists protested against the translation at that time, and would have nothing to do with it. But since then the Baptists have adopted it, and they have been ever since trying to prove that it is the better translation. You say now, in effect, that those Episcopalians were better qualified to translate the Bible for you than you were yourselves. I know, though, that the ancient Baptists did not do that; I know that they protested against it. But now you are dependent on this translation, and while you know that, you are heaping your vituperations on my people. I think this ought to settle the "new revision" point.

I shall note one other point in this "parallel line" of Coffey's:

"If any man lack wisdom, | "Must send them to college  
let him ask of God.—*James*." | to learn them to preach."

Now, remember, this work is indorsed by brother Carr and brother Fulkerson. I want them to say if the "wisdom" spoken of here refers to education. Now, with all the anti-mission talent here, they ought to be able to answer that. What do you say? Again:

"Take the oversight there— "I will preach for \$500 a of; not for filthy lucre.—*Peter.*" year."

O yes, of course, we say to our people, If you don't give the money you will all go to the devil. You will all remember what I quoted from Watson on yesterday on that subject, that no man became a hireling until he exceeded Bible rights. I showed you what the Bible said, that a minister should have a support. Suppose it is five hundred or a thousand dollars; a minister knows best what it takes to support him. I showed you where some of your preachers would work five days in the week and preach on Sunday, and yet you heap your vituperations on men who cannot do it. Is that just?

I will pass to another point. The same writer says, "We are the only people that preach the truth." I ask what the Methodists, Reformers, and members of other denominations here, think about that. And it is true that these people proclaim from their pulpits on every occasion that they are the only people that preach the truth. I know this statement will not be called in question, because there are Baptist brethren before me now who know the truth of it, and who will not deny the statement of their own author. The Missionary Baptists do not do that. We have as much right to believe we are right, as have the Methodists and Reformers, and we ought to treat other denominations kindly on that subject.

Now I will turn to Coffey, where he speaks in regard to the separation that took place in the Little River Association in 1832. Coffey, page 37: "At said meeting the Association split on doctrine, and formed two separate bodies: the majority taking the name, Original Little River, the other party calling themselves the Little River Association."

Now, a year ago I stayed at the house of a brother in Tennessee who was present at that separation, and he told me emphatically a different thing. He told me exactly how the thing took place, and that a minority of them split off. And then I stayed all night at sister Stamp's, in Calloway County, and she told me the same thing. And I will prove the same thing by Benedict, on page 829: "Little River Association was formed in 1813; it was taken from the old *Red River* community, which is partly in Tennessee, under the head of which State I have placed it.

"Elders Dudley Williams, D. Brown, J. F. Woods and Nathan Ross were the principal preachers in the formation of this new interest. It comprised twenty-seven churches, twelve ordained preachers, and one thousand eight hundred and nine members. It was located in the west of Kentucky and Tennessee, and in the southern parts of the Territories of Illinois and Missouri. The Highland, Kentucky, and Muddy River Associations in Illinois, and some others, have been constituted from it.

"This Association split in 1833, on the Missionary question, and a new and small interest, claiming the name and constitution of the *original* body, was formed from it."

Now, in a note at the bottom of this same page is the following: "Communication of Rev. Joel E. Grace, 1846. This industrious correspondent has sent me the minutes of this body for a number of years past, and has given me the details of the troubles which *Little River* No. 2 has caused it, more fully than my limits will permit me to insert. It appears to be a strong and vigorous community, which has stood its ground amidst severe opposition from the anti party."

So here we see a strong and vigorous body that has stood its ground amidst severe opposition from the antimission party. Now, I claim that in 1846 this Little River Association had two thousand and seventeen members in it. How many did you ever have in the Little River Association? I doubt whether you ever had over one thousand. Here in 1846 it had two thousand and seventeen members, and I venture the assertion that it has not reached one thousand since. They say that that was a mistake. Then let them bring up their minutes.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, my questions still stand open, and not one of them have been answered; no attempt has been made to answer them. I will hold them open one day longer, and then we will see how it will go. Brother Hardy has raised a complaint that I failed to answer his first hour's speech. That was merely a quotation from the Scriptures, making no argument whatever. It was simply a collection of all the passages from the Bible bearing on his point of election and atonement. I made an answer to his election question, and I made an answer to his atonement point. But why does not he come up and answer the questions that I have propounded to him? I have set them up twice already, and I do not think it is necessary for me to do it again. Let him come up and say that any of the statements I have made are untrue. But I propose to go further than that. I propose to prove that he and his people preach that a sinner is not a subject of gospel address. I propose to prove that they write and preach that the sending of missionaries to the heathen is an abomination in the sight of God. They say that when we are converted, it is when God sends it; and I know many brethren who have lived and died in waiting for

conversion, but it never came, and they went down to their graves without hope. Mr. Hardy said once before that forty thousand dollars had been gotten up and sent by missionaries to the heathen, and that after five years time they reported back two Jews converted, and that one of them had fallen back. He thought that was a rather big price. That is the difference between him and Jesus Christ; for Jesus Christ said that the whole world was not worth one soul—all of it put together.

Ladies and gentlemen, I thank you.

[A recess was then taken until two o'clock P. M.]

---

### ELDER HARDY SAID:

[Afternoon Session.]

GENTLEMEN Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: During the intermission just now, there was an inquiry made of me whether brother Wallace was debating with me or with Coffey. I was unable to answer, and I turn the question over to him. My own opinion was that he had been debating with Coffey, and I just suggest to him that if he will attend to my arguments and answer them, he will have enough to do.

Now, I shall notice a few things that brother Wallace referred to in his last speech. He said that I stated in a debate in Crittenden County, that the first church in America was set up in 1639. Now, I just made a quotation from Benedict, and I remarked that no historian disputed what Bene-

dict said, that the first church in America was organized in 1639.

Then, Mr. Wallace tells us that he can join our church on infant baptism, apostasy, or anything else. Did you ever know anybody joining the Old Baptist Church on Pedo baptism, infant baptism, or any other kind of baptism outside of immersion?

By Mr. Wallace—I said I could get in your church believing in infant baptism or apostasy.

By Mr. Hardy—It is possible that some do creep into our church believing these things, but these people know we would not receive them if we knew it.

Then, Mr. Wallace says that all the learning among the Old Baptists could not translate the Bible. Has he any testimony to prove that a fact? The Old Baptists are scattered all over the United States. How does he know we have not got a man among us with talent or education sufficient to translate the Bible, if he saw fit to do it? What have the Missionary Baptists done? I don't dispute that they can translate the Bible, but in the translation they have translated themselves out of a name. At present the Bible reads, "In those days came John the Baptist;" and they read it, "In those days came John the Immerser."

My brother Wallace then appeals to the Methodists, Presbyterians and Campbellites to sympathize with him in his complaint against us because we say that we alone preach the truth. Now, I ask him whether the Campbellites do not say they preach the truth, and whether the other denominations do not claim the same thing. If Mr. Wallace preaches the truth, these other people preach what is untrue, and the reverse. The truth must be somewhere. Certainly he will

not claim that every religious order in the world preaches the truth as it is in the Bible. He appeals for the sympathy of the audience, and says we ought to treat our Pedo brethren with respect, and so on. You cannot find a Baptist brother anywhere that will say I treat them with disrespect. My neighbors are Pedobaptists, and I know that I treat them respectfully, and they do the same thing by me. Of course we do not fall out about it.

Then Mr. Wallace comes out and boasts about the number of his people. Is that any proof that they are right? The Bible says, "Fear not, little flock, for it is your Father's good pleasure," &c.

History of the Kettocton Baptist Association, page 134: "It is our expectation to live alone. Though few in number, we do not conceive we have cause to fear while truth is on our side. It has been the lot of the Baptists in every age to be a distinct people, from the present time back through the dark ages of Popery, although they then might pass by different names, as Waldenses, Wickliffites, Huszites, &c.; yet it is acknowledged they held the same doctrines and administered the ordinances in the same manner the Baptists do with us at this day." Here they say that though they are few in number, they have nothing to fear while truth is on their side; and that is where we stand to-day. Notwithstanding Mr. Wallace boasts of the number of his people, and of their wisdom, and their colleges, and all such things, the Baptists away back yonder say that they do not fear because they are small in number, for they say the truth is on their side. And let me tell you that our people stand on the truth as it is in the Lord Jesus Christ; we stand there to-day, and are persecuted for it, as we have ever been. There

has never been a time in the history of the world when the true followers of the Lord Jesus Christ have not been persecuted. The popular religion has never been that of the Lord Jesus Christ, and it never will be.

Mr. Wallace claims that the Philadelphia Baptist Association was a Missionary organization. Well, if they were, I reckon they preached Missionary doctrine. I have tried to get him to tell me whether he believed in general atonement, or whether he did not. The Baptists anciently did not believe in general atonement; for I have read their articles of faith, and proved it by them; and I expect to read more of them before this discussion is over.

I defy Mr. Wallace, or any other man, to point out any articles of faith in the world, previous to the division, where it is claimed that Christ redeemed the entire race of men when he suffered and died on the cross. I will show you, before this discussion ends, where this doctrine came from, and I will prove that it did not date back to the days of the Apostles.

Minutes Philadelphia Baptist Association, page 150: "When all the human race, by the sin of the first man, were involved in guilt, Rom. v. 12, and fallen under condemnation, and all became the children of wrath, it would manifestly be doing them no injustice if they were, to every individual, left in that state, and eternally punished for their sins; this would have been their proper desert, their just reward. But God, out of his mere free grace and love, without any moving cause in the parties chosen, hath predestinated some unto life, through a Mediator, Eph. i. 4; Rom. xi. 5, 6, (without any wrong done to others) together with all the means subservient to this end, viz., their redemption by

the blood of Christ, and renovation by the Spirit of holiness, to the praise of his glorious grace; the other left to act in sin, to their final destruction, to the glory of divine justice.—Rom. ix. 22, 23.” Is not this the very doctrine the brother is fighting here in this discussion? Is not he fighting the doctrine that the Baptists have forever believed and preached from the days of the Apostles down to the present time? Mr. Wallace says that we are afraid of Arminianism. I have only to say that Baptists have ever been afraid of it.

Page 263: “Good works are by no means the foundation of our acceptance or justification in the sight of God. Nothing that we ever have done, and nothing possible for us ever to perform, will have the least concern or weight in the important affair of our acquittal from guilt, and acceptance as righteous before the tribunal of a holy God. Nothing on earth or in heaven can be found to answer this glorious purpose but the finished righteousness and the atoning death of the great Immanuel, God with us.

“It is equally true, and may as evidently be deduced from the word of truth, that foreseen good works are not the cause of our election to salvation. One end of our election was to bring us to love and practice holiness; and, therefore, good works, or holiness of life, could not have been the reason of the eternal purpose to recover us to the divine image and favor. The purpose of election stands ‘not of works, but of him who calleth’.—Rom. ix. 11. All the graces of the Spirit, and all our acts of true religion and virtue, are to be considered as effects of the unconditional and eternal counsel of God in Christ.

“And permit us, dear brethren, further to add, that the same reasons, in effect, forbid us to suppose that good works

are the condition of our regeneration or of our being called out of darkness into marvellous light. If we are so happy as to be the subject of this glorious change, not a tribute of praise is to be ascribed to ourselves; but all the glory is to be given to God, 'who hath saved us, and called us with a holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began.'—2d Tim. i. 9." Have you ever heard a Missionary Baptist preach such as that? They say they believe in grace, but the question before them is, Do they believe in salvation by grace alone?

Page 311: Now remember these are the minutes of the Philadelphia Baptists from 1707 to 1807. Where I have turned to now is a circular letter, written by the instruction of the association, and adopted by the association, and inserted in its minutes in 1795. Mr. Wallace claims that that was a Missionary body. Well, just hear what they have to say: "From what we have said, various useful observations, by way of inference, might be made; but we shall only mention two: First, that according to the gospel, the atonement of Christ did not extend to every individual of the human race; and, secondly, that the gospel contains no conditional offers of salvation." Do the Missionary Baptists of to-day preach in that way? Do they believe that way to-day? "We may mention these, because some in our days seem to favor such notions, and some others, that tend to man and go a great way towards sullyng the glory of the gospel.

"In regard to the first, if atonement was made for all, it was God's intention that it should; that intention must have its full effect; the effect must be that all must and will be saved.

“If Christ answered the demands of law and justice for all, and paid the price in full, then there must be guiltless persons in hell for want of being made meet for heaven. Christ has done his part, but the Spirit declines doing his. Why God should appoint satisfaction to be made for all, and afterwards not renew and sanctify all, and bring them to heaven, must be very strange, and utterly inconsistent with the glory and perfections of him who does nothing in vain, who never does a part, without doing the whole, who always finishes what he begins.

“It is manifest from the Holy Scriptures that Christ made atonement for his people, Isa. liii. 8; Luke i. 68; his sheep, John x. 15, 26, 29; xvii. 9; those that were given him, Heb. ii. 13; who were redeemed from among others.—Rev. v. 9.

“As to the second, to make salvation conditional, would rob God of his sovereignty, and make his glory to depend on man, while at the same time it would give room for boasting. It would also convert the gospel of the grace of God into a new law. Is the law of works to be preferred to the covenant of grace? If it be of grace, says the Apostle, then it is no more of works, otherwise grace is no more grace. What! make our happiness depend on man? If we will do part, God will do the rest. Alas! what can man do in the business of his salvation first or last, to merit or promote it? Is he altogether dependent on God? Yea, verily, that at every step, in the beginning and progress of the glorious work, he may cry, Grace, grace; and whosoever glorieth, let him glory in the Lord.”

Now, if brother Wallace indorses the doctrine of this people, why does not he come up in fellowship with them? I for one will take in any man who indorses this Philadelphia-

Baptist doctrine. We have never denied this, and we have never denied it being the doctrine of the Bible preached by Christ and his Apostles. If the Missionary Baptists to-day believe this, let them come up and admit it, and not go to fighting the system upon which the Old Baptists of to-day stand.

Now, I want to refer to Coffey, page 15: "After our painful separation from the Missionaries in 1836, a number of churches in the bounds of the Old Concord Association met together and formed the Stone River Association. We had then, as was generally supposed, a strong and happy union; but alas! there was an element of heresy incorporated in that body as bad, if not worse, than that from which we had just withdrawn" (page 25.) Coffey tells us here of the heresy brought to view here. The brother says that it was the "Two-Seed doctrine," and then he tells you that Coffey refers to Watson, and says that doubtless this heresy was the "Nonresurrectionism doctrine." Now, I want him to separate the two, and tell us the distinction between Nonresurrectionism and the Two-Seed doctrine.

See Watson, page 293: Speaking of the Two-Seed doctrine, he tells us what that doctrine is.

"7. They affirm that, at death, the soul returns to God, and the seed of Satan to him.

"8. They deny the resurrection of the bodies of the just and unjust."

Now, Coffey was right when he said that doubtless Watson had reference to the Nonresurrection doctrine, for the Two-Seed doctrine is the Nonresurrection doctrine, and you cannot doubt it. Watson comes out and admits it; and therefore it is clear that Coffey told the truth.

Now, I have stated before this intelligent congregation, and proved it, that the Old Baptists never have taught that Christ redeemed the race of man. That has never been the doctrine of the Baptists. They have ever believed that there was a people chosen in Christ before the foundation of the world, and Christ redeemed those people.

Now, I am going to speak of Arminianism. Mr. Wallace has talked considerably about Arminianism, and says the Old Baptists are afraid of it. Well, they did not use to be afraid of it, because it was not in existence among the ancient Baptists. I am going to tell you where Arminianism originated, and it originated right where this universal-atonement system did.

Benedict, first volume, page 189: "The Baptists in England are divided into *General* and *Particular*, and have been since soon after the Reformation. Their principal difference is in point of doctrine." We see that one sect of these Baptists believed in general atonement, and that the other believed in special atonement.

Benedict, first volume, page 224:

"GENERAL BAPTISTS.—This term has from the beginning of the Reformation been applied to that class of Baptists in England who have held universal redemption. The Particular Baptist are strictly Calvinistic in their creed. But those who are called General lean to the American system. The former hold that Christ died for the elect only, while the latter plead that the Saviour by his death and sufferings has made salvation possible for all."

Here the distinction is clearly drawn. One was called General Baptists, and they were so called from the fact that they believed in general atonement; and the other was called

Calvinistic Baptists, because they believed in a special atonement. Notice here particularly that this people believed in a general atonement, and that the Baptists were divided on that question, and that that began at the time of the Reformation. You cannot trace this system beyond the Reformation, for it began when James Arminius began to preach it.

Benedict, second volume, page 61: "The reader must keep in mind that in this day those were called Arminians who held to the universal provision of the gospel, or that the atonement of Christ was general in its nature." Here again we are told distinctly what Arminianism is.

Benedict, first volume, page 41: "The Arminians were so called from James Arminius, who died at Leyden, in Holland, in 1609, just a hundred years after Calvin was born. Arminius warmly opposed Calvin's notions respecting predestination."

Mosheim, second volume, page 279: "The Arminians derive their name and origin from James Arminius." Here, too, we learn that Arminianism is general atonement, that when Christ died on the cross he made salvation possible for all men. We have seen, however, that the Baptists did not believe this doctrine previous to the Reformation.

Benedict, page 801: "The Concord Association split on doctrine about twenty years past; both bodies called themselves Concord; the Calvinistic party claimed to be *first*, and the Arminian division was accounted the *second*." Here we see that Benedict acknowledges himself that one was called Calvinistic Baptists and the other Arminians, that one people believed in general atonement and the other in special atonement.

And let me remark further that in the division of the Lit-

the River Association in 1833, we find that they split on that very doctrine, one party believing in general atonement, and the other party not believing it. One party believed that Christ redeemed his people from under the curse of the law, and that he died for them; while the other party believed that he died for the race of man. Now, I want to know if, at the present day, the Missionary Baptists are not really the Arminian party. But they do not take the position here that they are Calvinists. Show me your position and prove it by history, and trace your party from the days of the Apostles down to the present time.

---

REV. MR. WALLACE SAID

GENTLEMEN Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: I am before you again, feeling easy and comfortable. Mr. Hardy has so far failed to answer any of the questions I put to him yesterday morning, and I have no idea he will attempt to answer them. To-morrow, at noon, I will commence on them myself.

The first thing that he started out with in his last speech was a question as to whether I was debating with him or with Coffey. I quoted from Coffey as one of their own writers, and left it with Mr. Hardy to establish him as an honest historian. I have proved emphatically by history that Coffey is not an honest historian; yet there are brethren here who indorse him as such. Now, I ask them why they have not met my charge that he is not an honest historian.

They have not met them, nor will they attempt to meet them. I think I have proved my charges on that point to the satisfaction of this people.

Mr. Hardy quotes from Watson, and attempts to prove that Coffey was right in saying that Watson referred to non-resurrectionism. Did not Watson say distinctly that it was "Two-Seedism?" And he then calls on me to make a distinction between nonresurrectionism and Two-Seedism. The Two-Seed doctrine is that God made a portion of the people, and a small portion at that, and that the devil made the rest; that God gets what he made, and the devil gets the biggest part. That is Two-Seedism. The Old Baptist doctrine is that God made them all; that he gives the devil the best portion of them, and he takes the few. That is the distinction. If God sent Jesus Christ to die for a few, he was mighty partial to let the devil have so many. O, says brother Hardy, we are the sheep—a little flock. Why, so far as that is concerned, we have here in the United States a denomination called the Seven Day Baptists, that is fewer in number than you are. There are only seven thousand of them in the United States, and you are much stronger than that. Consequently you are gone up on your "little flock" business.

Mr. Hardy says, "I have tried to get Mr. Wallace to say whether he believes in general atonement or not." I ask the question, Am I under any obligation to answer it again? Now, I know there are ladies and gentlemen before me of discernment. They know that I answered it twice yesterday. Did not I tell him emphatically that Jesus Christ died for the just and the unjust—that by the grace of God he had tasted death for every man? And does not the Bible say so? Here is another question for Mr. Hardy. God in his divine word

says he will send his rain on the just and the unjust. Now, draw a distinction between the two expressions. Bring your mathematical powers to bear on this, and tell me the difference between the two expressions. Bring your theological powers together on that, and may be by to-morrow morning you can frame an answer.

Now, Mr. Hardy in his last speech had a great deal to say about works. Did not I ask him on yesterday, as the rules say you shall not charge a thing on your opponent until he avows it, did not I ask him once or twice to make the charge? If he will make it, I am ready to answer it. Of course, when I come to produce my negative proof I will answer it. Mr. Hardy fears to make the charge, but simply wants to make an impression. He had a great deal to say about Calvinists and Arminians. I will show you my system long before the Reformation, and long before the Calvinists or Arminians had an existence. I am not an Arminian, I am not a Calvinist; I am a Bible Baptist. I am not a follower of Calvin, because he believed in infant baptism, and so did Arminius, and I don't believe the doctrine of either of them. I can show you articles of faith made long before these men were born. I stand on the doctrine and teachings of God's divine word, and there I will stand as long as I have an existence; as long as my reason is enthroned I propose to stand on its teachings. But I tell you, before this discussion closes, when I assume the burden of proof, I will cross the Reformation.

Now let us have a little more Coffey. A friend of mine asked me if I could not get along without so much Coffey; I suppose some here have had enough, but I will try some more. On page 107 Coffey says: "In 1775 an application

was made for the Association to ordain an itinerant to officiate among them; but so cautious were they of doing anything which could be construed into an assumption of power, that they declined." That is a quotation from Benedict, page 606. I judge from this that Coffey must have seen Benedict's work. Now I will show you where Coffey has garbled this quotation; and what are we to think of a writer who garbles a quotation to sustain what he says? Is he an honest historian? I will show you where Coffey here makes a full period at "declined," that there is not even a comma in Benedict.

Benedict, page 606: "In 1775 an application was made for the Association to ordain an itinerant minister to officiate among them; but so cautious were they of doing anything which could be construed into an assumption of power, that they declined *the proposal, and advised the church to a different and more consistent course.*" Here, in the Philadelphia Association, a certain plan came up before them in 1775; that plan did not suit them, and they declined the proposal, and advised the church to another different and more consistent course. Do you see where Mr. Coffey garbles this quotation? And I ask, Is a man who would do that honest? I do not care if he was one of my own brethren who would do such a thing, I would be in favor of expelling him, and never admit him again; much less would I recommend his work to all inquirers after truth.

Now, as to the point of whom Christ came into the world to save, notice the following from Coffey, page 126: "Christ came into the world to save his people from their sins; that he by his sufferings and death canceled all their sins; that in his own appointed time and way he will call, regenerate

and sanctify them; in short, manifest himself to each and every one of them; and that it is impossible they can refuse the call; did not manifest such anxiety from fear that sinners would be lost."

Here Coffey says Christ had no anxiety for the salvation of sinners; and that is the doctrine of Mr. Hardy's people, preached throughout this land and country. No, say they, he came to save the "sheep." They are sheep-feeders. Dr. Watson says "there are people among us who are good sheep-feeders," but that they are bad hunters. He says they are bad fishermen, and when they go for fish they never catch any. That is so, because they don't cast the bait in the right place. And just as long as you refuse to do right, it will have bad results. Watson says their church has failed. "Few," he says, "are coming into our churches;" and that if we (they) do not do this thing, other people will do it.

And brother Hardy talks about predestination. Now, I am one of the best predestinarianists in the world. For the good Book tells me if you don't do your duty you will be punished with many stripes. God says if a man knows his duty and does not do it, he will be striped.

One or two more quotations from Coffey and I will leave him for this evening. Here, on page 153, he rants about the Missionary Baptists stealing their name. Now, I am not here to defend any such of our brethren. It may be that they will steal; but I will defend their intelligence. However, when our brethren go out to steal, they will steal something better than a forty year old name. They are mighty afraid the Missionary Baptists will steal their name that they have had since 1832. They had some increase up to 1840, and then went back again, and I will show you how many

they have fallen off since that time. I have asked brother Hardy to say how many they have excluded, and he has failed to answer.

Just one more from Coffey. On page 173 we have the doctrine of one brother Carr, who wrote the appendix to this work. I said on yesterday that they preached that a sinner was not a subject of gospel address, and they said they preached without discrimination. Here is what brother Carr says: "They remain in a dead state until quickened by the voice, the Spirit, the power of God Almighty. When quickened, one is then a subject of gospel address." Of course, the inference is that until he is quickened he is not a subject of gospel address. "When quickened, one is then a subject of gospel address; having had the blinded eyes opened, and the deaf ear unstopped." Here he says that when the sinner has his blinded eyes opened, and the deaf ear unstopped, he then becomes a subject of gospel address; but before that, he is not a subject of gospel address; and that is the reason they don't call on the sinner to repent, just as Watson charges them with preaching the gospel as to the sheep; and that is their doctrine throughout this land and country. They claim that a sinner is so dead in sin that he cannot hear the gospel of God. Paul said he was not ashamed to preach the gospel even at Rome, right were the heathen were. He said, "I am not ashamed of the gospel, because it is the power of God unto salvation." But these people deny that it has anything to do with salvation—that the sinner is saved from eternity. I can prove that. I heard it from your pulpit; and I know there are others here who have heard the same thing; and if it is disputed, I can bring the charge home. It is written here in Coffey, in the appendix, written

by a man Carr, who recommends Coffey; and I have proved Coffey to be a dishonest historian, and no one here will attempt to vindicate him. Some of his neighbors are here, I suppose, and they have never made an attempt to vindicate him since I have made the charge. Even brother Hardy went back and showed missionary operations that Baptists said they commended, and consequently he cannot vindicate the historian on that point.

Now I am done with Coffey, until I come to the articles of faith. I told you yesterday I would prove my position by his own works. Rev. P. Douglas Gouie, a Pedobaptist writer, published a book called "The Churches and Sects of the United States," and under the head of Antimission Baptists the following occurs: "The Baptists with the above prefix are such as refuse to unite with the Regular Baptist Church in the support of missionary operations, and some other objects of a general and denominational character. It is understood that their refusal is based upon the ground of the unscriptural character of the missionary operations of the present day. Indeed, many go so far as to deny the utility and lawfulness of modern missionary efforts, and maintain that no requirements are made by Jesus Christ in relation to supporting missionaries among the heathen. The Antimission Baptists do not prevail very extensively in the Eastern or Middle States, but are found principally in the Western or Southwestern portions of the United States. They were formerly all connected with the Regular Baptists, but for certain reasons preferred withdrawing their fellowship from the churches or associations with which they had been united, and forming a denomination of their own."

Now, this is the testimony of an impartial historian, who is a Pedobaptist.

Now I will quote from Hitchcock, who is another Pedo writer, and equally impartial, and I will prove exactly the same thing. And this, I think, ought to settle the controversy on that point. See Hitchcock, page 1117, under the head of Baptists: "Who hold that a personal profession of faith and an immersion in water are essential to baptism. They claim that they have existed as christian communities from the days of the Apostles, and have held pure the doctrines and ordinances of the gospel through all ages. The first Baptist Church in America was founded by Roger Williams in Providence, R. I., in 1639." He then goes on to give the number of churches, members, &c., in England; but I will pass on to what he says of the Baptists in the United States. "In the United States the growth of the denomination was not rapid till after the war of the Revolution. They have now eight thousand three hundred and forty-six ministers, twelve thousand nine hundred and fifty-five churches, and one million ninety-four thousand eight hundred and six members. They have under their control thirty colleges and fourteen theological seminaries. In the British Provinces of America, four hundred and forty-four ministers, six hundred and fifty churches, and sixty-two thousand four hundred and fifteen members. Besides the Regular Baptists, there are nine other minor sects, which have five thousand and twenty-two ministers, eight thousand seven hundred and ten churches, and seven hundred and fifty-nine thousand five hundred and seventy-six members. These minor sects are Old School Baptists, Free Will Baptists," and so on. I repeat that this is another impartial historian, who says em-

phatically that brother Hardy's denomination has left the Regular Baptist Church. Now, let them call Hitchcock a dishonest historian, if they want to; that is their privilege; but if they can prove that these historians are untruthful, they may set aside what they want to.

Hitchcock, also on the same page, under the title of Antimission Baptists: "Antimission Baptists—call themselves Old School Baptists." Elder Trott says that when they left the church they took the distinct appellation of "Old School," and here we find Hitchcock says the same thing. So far as your name is concerned, as distinguishing you from other denominations, I do not object to it; but if you mean to say you are older than other Baptist denominations, I deny it. I have shown that it is not the case.

I shall now come up to our own Baptist historians. I have heretofore dealt with theirs, but I propose after this to take up our own works and prove what I have said emphatically. So far as this matter of general atonement is concerned, I assure you I will reach that, and I assure you that I will cross the Reformation. I will show you that these people have changed their articles of faith; for I defy them to show an article of faith in use among them like the one of the General Association of 1689 that the Philadelphia Association adopted. I will show the use of tracts a thousand years ago. A tract was merely a discussion; and yet you are forever heaping your vituperations on these tracts, and yet here they were in existence long before the Reformation. Here we are told in history that they were scattered long before the Reformation. I will show you also where missionaries were sent among the heathen long before. That is something they have never heard of, I suppose, not even in the United States,

except the case of brother Fulkerson, who was sent to Kansas and had his expenses paid. They abuse missionary operations; and so far as going into the highways, as commanded by Jesus Christ, they have never done it, but have taken up their time in heaping their calumniations upon us.

---

### ELDER HARDY SAID:

GENTLEMEN Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: I am again before you, ready to proceed. It seems to me that while Mr. Wallace complains a great deal of Coffey, he likes it very much. If I disliked Coffey as much as he seems to, I don't think I would use it as much as he does. He wants to make it appear to this people that Coffey garbled a quotation from Benedict in regard to the ordaining of an itinerant in the Philadelphia Association. Now, it would seem to me that where Benedict refers to this matter, he is quoting from the minutes of the Philadelphia Association. He does not attempt to give the words, but, I suppose, means to give it in substance. However, he does not give it as it appears in the minutes of the Philadelphia Baptist Association. It seems there was a query came before that association upon that subject, and that association said it had no such right. The Philadelphia Association in 1775 claimed emphatically that they had no right to ordain an itinerant and send him out to preach. If they had no right at that time, I want to know where the Missionary Baptists get the right to do it today. Has not the Philadelphia Association as much right to

do that thing as any people on earth? Did not they have as much right as the people of to-day have? Mr. Wallace makes a great to do here because the Philadelphia Baptists would not do as he does. I may say that I do not wonder at that.

Then he reads from Coffey on page 126, and makes the statement that Coffey says that Jesus Christ has no anxiety for the salvation of sinners. I certainly can find no such statement in Coffey as that. I will read the quotation, and then leave it to this congregation who has been garbled. Coffey, page 125: "But the Regular Baptists, believing that Jesus Christ came into the world to save his people from their sins; that by his sufferings and death canceled all their sins; that in his own appointed time and way he will call, regenerate and sanctify them; in short, manifest himself to each and every one of them; and that it is impossible they can refuse the call; did not manifest such anxiety from fear that sinners would be lost. They are still promulgating the gospel for the purpose of the edifying of the body of Christ; for the perfecting of the saints." I leave that matter right there.

When my last half hour of time ran out I was speaking in regard to what were termed "Calvinistic Baptists." Mr. Wallace says that he is not a Calvinistic Baptist nor an Arminian Baptist. As far as the Calvinistic are concerned, they were not alone called Calvinistic Baptists; they went by many names, and they were reproachfully called Calvinistic. We find that Calvin believed the doctrines of the Waldenses. I know that he believed in sprinkling for baptism, but he believed in the doctrine of election and predestination, and that God chose his people in Christ before the foundation of the world, just like the Waldenses believed,

and just like these articles of faith that I have been reading to-day show.

See Benedict, second volume, page 419: "From nearly the beginning of the Baptists in America, there have been some who have opposed a number of the principle articles in the Calvinistic creed. For a long time, most of these brethren resided in Rhode Island and its vicinity, where their history has been related. For some years there were many of those, improperly called Separate Baptists, in Virginia, and the more Southern States, who were called Arminians, because they maintained that by the sufferings of Christ salvation was made possible for every individual of Adam's ruined posterity. The issue of the contest on this point may be found under the head of Virginia. And besides, there have always been some churches and many individuals who have objected to some of the strong points of Calvinism, or adopted them with some peculiar modifications; but no very considerable party of this character arose until a little more than thirty years ago, when one was founded by Elder Benjamin Randal, of New Durham, New Hampshire. This Elder Randal, as his biographer observes, was led, about 1780, "to object against the whole doctrine of John Calvin, with respect to eternal, particular, personal, unconditional election and reprobation." Benedict states here there were no people of a very considerable number until about 1780 that opposed this doctrine that is set forth here that Calvin believed; and the Waldenses, as I have said, believed the same thing. And all the Baptists that come up from the days of the Apostles believe this doctrine of particular redemption.

Jones's Church History, page 347: "Pope Pius II. declares

the doctrine taught by Calvin to be the same as that of the Waldenses."

Orchard, page 253: "Yet the Baptists were still a scattered community, and were named now Anabaptist and Picard Calvinists."

Orchard, page 296: "Lindamus, a Catholic bishop, asserts, Calvin inherited the doctrines of the Waldenses."

This proves to my mind that Calvin believed in the doctrine of the Waldenses. It has been asserted that that doctrine originated with Calvin; but history states positively that the doctrine of the Waldenses and that of Calvin was the same; and if we believe in the doctrine of Calvin to-day, we believe the doctrine of the Waldenses, because Orchard says distinctly that Calvin inherited his doctrine from the Waldenses.

In Benedict, second volume, page 34: "The Ketocton Association was formed in 1766, and was the fifth association of Calvinistic Baptists in America." It says that this is the fifth association of Baptists organized in America, and it says that the first association organized in America was organized on the very platform that the Regular Baptists stand on to-day. The Ketocton Association was the fifth that was organized on the Calvinistic platform. Tell me where the Missionary Baptists were then. Why, it was long before they came into existence.

See History of the Ketocton Association, page 53: "A very great difference appears between the primitive preachers and some modern ones; when persons were wrought upon and their hearts opened, and inquiry made what they should do to be saved, the former instructed them to believe in the Lord Jesus, to repent and be baptized in the name of the

Lord Jesus, for the remission of sin, and they should receive the gift of the Holy Ghost; but the latter say, Come, be prayed for; after prayer they are sometimes asked if they feel no better, whether some alterations have not taken place, whether some comfort has not been afforded the mind, and then a loud-toned exhortation, until weak minds, and soft, tender passions have been reduced to a state unaccountable to themselves. How easy for persons so confounded to be persuaded they are converted, and so be lulled into the embraces of a strong delusion." We are told here that there is a difference between the ancient preachers and the modern preachers. Don't you know when the question came up on the day of Pentecost as to what men were to do to be saved, the reply was, "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. For the promise is unto you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call?" and not as many as the Missionary Baptists shall call. The calling belongs to the Lord Jesus Christ; and I tell you when he calls them to repentance it comes. Now, I profess to preach repentance to the people, but I preach it not in the name of the sinner or preacher, but in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ. I do not tell people that a sinner can repent until Jesus can give him repentance.

Mosheim, first volume, page 165: "When once the ministers of the church had departed from the ancient simplicity of religious worship, and sullied the native purity of divine truth by a motley mixture of human inventions, it was difficult to set bounds to this growing corruption."

History of the Ketaocton Association, page 43: "But not

all the device or artifice exercised by men can disappoint the divine purpose, or destroy the child of promise, nor prevent his conversion a moment longer than divine power thinks proper to delay his interference." Did not the Baptists back yonder teach that it was not by means that the repentance was brought to men? Mr. Wallace has had a right smart to say about means. Let me say here to-day that I believe all the means in the salvation of a sinner is ordained of God. I believe it is all taught in the Scriptures. I never have denied means, but let me tell you that I deny that the inventions of men are any means in the salvation of sinners. And when people come up and try to force repentance on these people by means outside of the word of God, let me tell you not to receive it, but take the Bible teachings, and leave out everything else.

Mr. Wallace seems to be mightily afraid of the articles of faith, the articles of faith we hold, and those that they hold. They say that we believe in the Old and the New Testament as the only rule of practice. Now, I want to know if it says you can go outside of the Bible practice and do things that the Bible says nothing about. The Bible says that it is the only rule.

Belcher, page 243. This is a Missionary Baptist historian, and Mr. Wallace avers, a truthful man: "A century ago, comparatively little activity, or concern for the extension of the christian cause distinguished the Baptist denomination in any part of the world. Jonathan Edwards, in this country, and Andrew Fuller, of England, were raised up in the providence of God to excite increased attention to the theology of the churches, while George Whitfield and John Wesley, like 'Sons of Thunder,' awoke up many thousands,

on both continents, to serious thought. As this work spread, there grew with it a vastly increased desire that men, everywhere, should become acquainted with religion; and Sunday Schools, and missionary, Bible, and religious societies, to accomplish this purpose, rose up, in rapid succession, throughout Christendom; and no man will deny but that they have accomplished great results.

“It was scarcely to be expected, however, that so vast a change could take place without some degree of opposition; and the Baptist body was soon found to present two contending parties. One of these maintained that the commission of the Redeemer to preach the gospel to all nations, and the conduct of the Apostles in teaching that God had commanded all men everywhere to repent, made it imperative on the church to seek the evangelization of the world; and for this purpose they formed missionary and other kindred institutions. The other party, however, insisted that the accomplishment of the divine purpose did not depend on the efforts of man, however zealous, and that as all these societies were of human origin, they were a departure from Baptist principles, and offensive to God. This contention, more or less, came into action in the various associations throughout the country, and the parties soon began to separate from each other.” \* \* \* \* \*

“It will be seen from this statement that the Old School Baptists do not repudiate the general doctrine of the Baptist body, nor have they renounced their views of church government, or changed their mode of worship.” As I remarked, this is from a Missionary Baptist writer, and I think it is a good deal for a Missionary to say. I venture to say that brother Wallace would not say any such a thing as that.

It is possible, however, that he will now deny what this Missionary Baptist states. If he denies it, he must impeach the veracity of his own historian.

Cramp's History, page 576: "In 1813 the Baptist Churches of the United States were awakened to a sense of their indebtedness to the world by the gracious interposition which brought Judson and Rice among them. Then their missionary career commenced."

Benedict, second volume, pages 145 and 146: "In 1800 the proposition of the Philadelphia Association to establish a general conference of the Baptist Association throughout the United States was taken into consideration, and it was voted that 'if a well-digested plan should be devised for such a coalition, in which the proper objects were clearly pointed out, with suitable measures to attain them, and the danger of perversion and abuse well guarded against, and if a general concurrence in the undertaking should be obtained of the churches in the United States, this Association are disposed to give it their support.' In the same year, the Association recommended to churches destitute of pastors, to endeavor to support public worship by engaging some of their members to read sermons and take a lead in prayer."

"In 1801 they petitioned the Legislature for an amendment of the law, passed the preceding year, imposing restrictions on religious meetings, so far as respects persons of color. The petition was renewed the next year, and attended with a degree of success. The thanks of the association were returned to General Charles Cotesworth Pinckney, Major Thomas Pinkney, and Henry William Desaussure Esq, for their patriotic exertions in its behalf.

"In 1802 provision was made for the employment of a mis-

sionary to travel and preach in destitute places. The object failed of accomplishment for the want of a suitable person to undertake it." It seems from this that at that time they had no suitable man to perform this service.

---

REV. MR. WALLACE SAID

GENTLEMEN Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: I am before you again with my offsetting argument, but I desire first to call the attention of the congregation to the fact that Mr. Hardy has not yet answered the first of the questions I put to him, and there are eighteen of them, and I venture to say he will not. Some of them he could answer, and others he could not. Those of them that are diametrically opposed to his doctrine he doesn't want to touch, and of course those that he cannot touch he will not attempt, because he doesn't know.

Now, he says in regard to my charge of garbling by Coffey, that the quotation I referred to was taken from the minutes of the Philadelphia Baptist Association. As to that, I have to say that Coffey gives the page of the book where he takes the garbled quotation from. He says on page 107 of his work, "We will quote from Benedict, page 606." I have before compared his quotation with the original in Benedict, and shown conclusively where Coffey garbled. Now, I presume from the picture of brother Coffey in his work that he is a very old man, and I suppose when he was reading Benedict at this point his spectacles must have dropped very low

down on his nose, because this quotation that he makes is at the very bottom of the page. If his spectacles had been higher up he would have found the following on the same page. Benedict, page 606: "In the minutes for 1769, among the delegates were Hezekiah Smith and John Gano, and their doings show a strong solicitude for the welfare of R. I. College, then in its infancy, and collections and appropriation for ministerial education.

"In 1774, by request, brother John Gano gave an account of his travels to the southward by appointment of the association. By which it appears that he had been indefatigable in his labors, and that a minister traveling annually on the plan proposed may answer very valuable purposes."

Now, Mr. Hardy says emphatically that missions commenced in 1816, and Coffey says the same thing, and it is attempted to vindicate that assertion, when we see from the very page that Coffey makes his quotation from, a contradiction of it. Therefore I charge Coffey with being a dishonest historian; and, as I before remarked, any man in my denomination that would be guilty of such a thing, I would be in favor of excluding him from it. I thought I was through with Coffey a little while ago, but I find I will have to refer to him again. See Coffey, page 122. Here he is speaking of Gano, Miller and Vanhorn, and he asks, "Were they of the modern type? Were they 'the best of men waiting, only the money is wanting' to enable the 'Board' to send them? And were they sent at a stipulated salary by life directors? Or did not the Philadelphia Association, on receiving the intelligence of the deplorable condition of some of the churches in Virginia and North Carolina, request the above named

ministers to visit them ? And did they not 'go ye' on the Bible plan, and, like the ancient Baptists, 'single handed, without funds ?' "

Mr. Coffey asks the question if these missionaries did not go at their own expense and without funds. In answer to that, I refer to Benedict, page 707.

" In 1755 the association taking into consideration the destitute condition of many places in the interior settlements of this and the neighboring States, (then Provinces) recommended to the churches to make contributions for the support of a missionary to itinerate in those parts."

Mr. Benedict makes the statement that contributions were made up ; Coffey says they were not. In view of this, I repeat that Coffey is a dishonest historian. But to proceed with Benedict.

" Mr. Hart was authorized and requested, provided a sufficient sum should be raised, to procure if possible a suitable person for this purpose. With this view he visited Pennsylvania and New Jersey in the following year, and prevailed with the Rev. John Gano to undertake the service, who attended the annual meeting and was cordially received. The association requested Mr. Gano to visit Yadkin settlement in North Carolina first, and afterwards to bestow his labors wherever providence should appear to direct."

Benedict, page 709: "This association has now existed ninety-six years, and during this long period it has been uniform in its principles and pursuits, having been under the management of men of intelligence and stability. Among its early doings it paid peculiar attention to the cause of missions, ministerial education, and all benevolent institutions then patronized and promoted by evangelical christians.

“So deeply were they imbued with the spirit of missions that almost a hundred years since they sent more than a thousand miles for Rev. John Gano to become their missionary in destitute parts of their own State and of North Carolina. He was appointed and supported in the same manner as missionaries are at the present time.”

This is Benedict; Coffey says they went without funds. But I will show you, before I close this discussion, that on one occasion there was four hundred dollars raised at a prayer meeting, years before Mr. Hardy's people had an existence—something they never had in their life. They never had an organized prayer meeting. I heard one old brother say, “I wish they would hold prayer meetings as the old Baptists used to.” Now, I am aware that the old Baptists did that thing; but, Mr. Hardy, you are not the old Baptists. I will show you where the old Baptists had organized prayer meetings, and the most glorious protracted meetings, when brother Hardy was united with us, before the separation. I will show you in the case of the Kehukee Association, an anti-mission body, where they had some of the most glorious protracted meetings recorded in history.

Brother Hardy has said that he did preach repentance. Then, suppose we join hands, drop this discussion and have a great reunion at Mount Carmel Church. Suppose we meet together as we did anciently, and pray to God to give us a revival, as we did when we were united. For I will show this people that the most glorious revivals we ever had was while brother Hardy's people were united with ours.

Mr. Hardy has something to say about sinners being called up to be prayed for. I think I will silence him on that point. Mr. Hardy does not deny that he receives converts into his

denomination, but they preach that the converting of sinners is the devil's work; however, they don't object to receiving the devil's material whenever they can get it. They say that these protracted meetings are moonshine and fox-fire. Well, in order to see fox-fire a man has to be in the dark, and I would recommend to these people to come out of the darkness, and they will not see so much fox-fire in glorious revivals. Fox-fire recedes when daylight appears, and if you will come out of the darkness of ignorance into the broad light of day, you will not see so much fox-fire in these revivals. O yes, brother Hardy, you may sneer at these glorious revivals, but at the same time you have no objection to receiving the fruits of them into your church. I will show you that those old Baptists had protracted meetings, before I close—that they had glorious revivals where people came up to be prayed for, as much so as we have at the present time. Wait until I get ready and I will show you that they occurred long before Mr. Hardy's denomination had an existence. I will show that in the Kehukee Association, that has now its prescriptions against these things, having departed from the first union.

The proposition in dispute here says that they "do now maintain the doctrine and practices of the ancient Baptists." Now, if you do not hold protracted meetings you cannot substantiate that claim, and so with the support of theological schools; for I will show you the existence of these schools long before the Reformation. Mr. Hardy claims there was no such thing until 1816. I promise to yet go back in the Bible and show protracted meetings and missionary operations.

Mr. Hardy also says, "I believe in means, and never have

denied it." Now, brother Hardy, you or I have made a mistake since we commenced debating here. I have said, since I came here, that you called on your God at Zion Church to witness that you did not believe in means. Now, you say, you have never denied it. Which of us is wrong about this? There is certainly a mistake somewhere. If I am mistaken in any statement, I have said I would take it back. God knows I would do it. I would not mislead one of my own, or any other denomination, and if I should do it; it would be out of ignorance and not willfully. If I have made a mistake about this, I am willing to recede from my statement. And I want my brother to say nothing more about this or do as I do. I think the best thing is to let it pass.

Then Mr. Hardy speaks about their "old name." You will remember that I quoted from Hitchcock to show that they assumed the name "Old Baptists" in 1832, when the separation took place in Virginia. I thought when Mr. Hardy was on this point that he was going to attempt to explain the appellation, "Old Baptists," as he did at Zion Hill. But he says the proposition does not say "Old Baptists," but "Regular Baptists." I tried to follow him to see how often he would use the expression, "Old Baptists," and I caught it twenty-one times. I asked him before to tell me the antecedent of the pronoun "we." You may guess why he did not answer it. I will not say why he did not. I asked him also in reference to repentance, whether the words "repent" and "believe" as commanded by the Savior are in the active or passive voice. He failed to answer that. Why? It seems to me it is a reasonable question.

Well, I have not much more at present, but I will try to manufacture enough to run a few minutes. I will speak of

Burchard's History of all denominations. That writer passes by these Old School Baptists entirely. Now, I do not know where the residence of Burchard was, but I do know that there are places in the United States where the name Old School Baptist is unknown, only as it is found in church histories. I know of places where men have lived and died and never heard an Antimission Baptist preach—hundreds of men that never knew such a denomination was in existence. In the State of New York they have two or three churches; in Ohio and Pennsylvania there are none; in the State of Maine they had four hundred and four members that seceded from the Regular Baptist Church. It is as Gorrie says, in the Middle and Eastern States they do not prevail in any number, and I will corroborate that by other histories before I close. I will show you where the strong Baptist denomination stood at that time. I will show you that in 1832, when the separation commenced in the State of Kentucky, that there were thirty-one thousand one hundred and forty-two Baptists in the State; in the Little River Association, a few years after the separation, there were two thousand one hundred and seventeen members, as they claim; I will show that they had not even a thousand in that association. I would like to have some one here to produce the minutes of the Little River Association. If any one here has it, I would like to see it. I will exhibit the minutes of our association, they are furnished to me every year, and I say I would be glad to have exhibited the strength of the Little River Association. I would like to see their history. I would like to know something of the discussion they had about receiving our members. I am told you had a difficulty about that years ago, when I was a boy; I don't know about that, but I

do know about the Two-Seedism fuss they had, when four or five members were thrown out of their church over it, and died out of the church. I know they never had any baptism except what they received from us, and I will prove it. I say they never had any baptism except what they received from the Regular Baptist Church.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, I am about through. One half day more, and I come to set up my negative proof, when I will proceed to cross the Reformation and go on until I come up to the days of the Apostles. I will show Baptist succession in the dark ages, and missionary tracts that were scattered throughout the land, and missionaries that traveled all over the country, and into the heathen nations; I will show you in the Bible, missionary plans where they were sent into heathen nations, and I will show you from the same authority, protracted meetings. And if I prove all this, I think it ought to forever settle the question.

Mr. Baker—From the audience, asked permission to make a statement. Assented to. He said: I have been familiar with the Baptists in this country for fifty years, and I never knew of them receiving the baptism of the Missionary Baptists, after the split took place in 1832 until about 1845. There was a church that belonged to the Still Creek Association that did receive two or three members on their letters, who had been baptized by Allcock Gord, down below here, and they took their letters of dismission from the church where they joined, and organized a new church. When they came forward to the association and asked for admittance, they were rejected. It caused a division in the association, part favoring the admission of the church and part opposing it, and that association went into dissolution. The associa-

tion was organized again and one of the preachers who favored receiving these members went down and baptized them. And if they have ever received the Missionary baptism except in the Still Creek Association, I never heard of it. Indeed, I know it has been all the time rejected.

Mr. Wallace—That association was not constituted at that time.

Mr. Baker—Still Creek Association was a part of the Clear River Association at that time.

Mr. Wallace—One more remark. I have long suffered the vituperations of this antission party, and I am prepared for anything from them. I have been anxious to satisfy my mind on this subject, and I have searched for history on it. I have written to different publishing houses for different works on the subject, but have been unable to find anything. I knew that was the point you would attack, that you had taken our baptism, and I have set up that you never had any but ours, and I say when you invalidate our baptism you invalidate your own. So far as the trouble about it is concerned I know nothing personally of it, for I was a boy at the time, but I did know of your Two-Seedism quarrel.

And now, ladies and gentlemen, I thank you for your attendance and hope you will all be in attendance to-morrow and give me your full attention.

[After the benediction the audience was dismissed to meet to-morrow morning.]

## ELDER HARDY SAID:

[Third Day—Morning Session.]

[The services were opened with prayer, after which, by request, the rules governing the discussion were read.]

GENTLEMEN Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: I may say in the beginning that I think it is no wonder that the people want the rules read, for I think it would be difficult for any person having heard the first part of this discussion to tell who was in the negative of the proposition and who in the affirmative; it seems to me Mr. Wallace has taken the affirmative without making any attempt to reply to my arguments. I certainly never heard of a proposition with two affirmatives without a negative. My understanding is that in all honorable controversies the person who assumes the negative should come up and meet the arguments of the affirmative. Has Mr. Wallace done that? Has he met any arguments that I have made, or attempted to show or shown that they were not the truth? You will remember that the day before yesterday he said that he purposed taking up Coffey, and that he thought that it would take him about all day to speak of him. He made no attempt to reply to my opening speech, but devoted nearly the whole of his time in trying to prove that Coffey had misrepresented facts, and that Coffey was a dishonest historian. I refer to one instance in particular. The same that I referred to yesterday in my last speech. Mr. Wallace said that if he made any statement that was not the truth he would take it back, and after I had

shown him where he had misrepresented Coffey, and that there was no such statement in that book as he said there was, I think he ought to have retracted it.

Mr. Wallace—What have you reference to? Name the page.

Mr. Hardy—I have referred to page 126. You stated that on this page Coffey said that Jesus Christ manifested no anxiety for sinners. I asserted and assert now that there is no such language in this book at all. Mr. Wallace, in our discussion over in Livingston County, said the same thing, that Coffey said that Jesus Christ had no anxiety for sinners, but that he came to save the elect, and in that connection I find a statement in the *Paducah News*, published after that discussion, where there was given a short account of that discussion, in which the statement is attributed to me. I don't know who wrote that article, because whoever did it was ashamed to sign his name to it.

I repeat that Coffey does not make any such statement; nor did I. It is a false accusation in both instances. I have read this passage from Coffey before, but I desire to do it again, and ask this congregation to listen attentively. Beginning on 125, it reads as follows: "But the Regular Baptists, believing that Jesus Christ came into this world to save his people from their sins; that he, by his sufferings and death, canceled all their sins; that in his own appointed time and way he will call, regenerate and sanctify them; in short, manifest himself to each and every one of them; and that it is impossible they can refuse the call; did not manifest such anxiety from fear that sinners would be lost." It is very clear, I think, from this that it was not Jesus Christ that was referred to as not manifesting anxiety for sinners, but it was

the Regular Baptists. We are not afraid that sinners will be lost, because Jesus Christ came into the world to save them.

I will proceed with my argument now. When my half hour expired yesterday evening I was speaking of the first missionary work in the United States. I will now finish that portion. I will quote from the minutes of the Little River Association of Missionary Baptists of 1869, page 4: "The first American Baptist Missionaries were sent out fifty-seven years ago." Any one can make the calculation for themselves, by deducting fifty-seven from sixty-nine, to find the year in which the first Missionary Baptist was sent out, and they will find it was in the year 1812. Mr. Wallace has tried to make this people believe that the Baptists have been a missionary body as they are in modern times from the beginning down to the present time, or, in other words, from the setting up of the gospel down to the present time. Now, we have a statement here emphatically that the first missionary sent out by the Baptists was in the year 1812. When did the Baptists come to America? They came in the year 1638 and organized a church. When did the Baptists first organize their first association in America? They got strong enough to do that thing in the year 1707, and after that many other associations were organized, but the first missionary, according to their own testimony, was sent out in 1812. If the Baptists away back there had been in the habit of sending out missionaries according to the modern style, what is the reason they did not do it in America? Was it because they did not need them, or because there was not money enough? Now, you see here that after the first association was organized it was over one hundred years before the Baptists sent

out a missionary in America, and now it is for Mr. Wallace to state the reason why they did not send them sooner.

Let me appeal to this congregation to-day and ask them where their dependence is. I doubt if there is any one here to-day but who desires to go to heaven. Now, if you wish to go there, there certainly must be some means by which you will go. If we are permitted to enter into paradise, I want to know who we shall praise when we get to that glorious world. Let us hear what the Missionary Baptists say.

Little Bethel Association, 1877. In the report on foreign missions, we find the following: "We owe to the missionary spirit our earthly civilization and our hope of heaven." What do they owe it to? Why, to the missionary spirit, they say, and not to God. Don't you see that the Lord Jesus Christ is left clear out of this system? Nowadays we have these missionary societies and tract societies; and Mr. Wallace tries to prove here that these things were in use among the Baptists anciently. O, he says, the Sunday School is one of the most wonderful things that ever existed. Why, it began away back yonder in 1781, almost before there were any Baptists. I say that these are new things among the Baptists, but we will come to that more particularly after awhile. I say we do not owe our hope of heaven to the foreign missionary spirit or anything of the kind, but we owe it to Jesus Christ.

Brother Wallace said on yesterday that the Old Baptists never had an organized prayer meeting, but he failed to prove that assertion. Brethren, it is a very easy matter to make an assertion, but it is a totally different one to prove it. I would like to see Mr. Wallace produce his proof on that point here. I know that the Regular Baptists have had prayer

meetings; for while he is probably acquainted with the few Baptists around here, it must be remembered that they are scattered all over the United States, and they are in places where he has never been to see what they do. Then he says we can see a great deal of fox-fire, and remarks that we are in the dark, and that if we were not in the dark we could not see the fox-fire. As to that, I would only ask if a man cannot stand in the light and see fox-fire in the dark. Put fox-fire in the light and it cannot be seen; but these people are in the dark, and consequently it is there that we see the fox-fire.

Mr. Wallace—That is the best thing you have gotten off since you have been speaking, and I am glad to have been able to help you to it.

Mr. Hardy—I am informed that there is a regular prayer meeting in the Little River Association at this time.

Mr. Wallace has labored here to prove that Coffey was wrong. I wonder if they have any historians on either side that have misrepresented anything. Now here in regard to the Kehukee Association, we find that D. B. Ray says that this Association was formed by churches gathered by the missionaries sent from the Philadelphia Association eighty years ago, prior to the Hard-shell separation in 1832; that missionaries were sent from the Philadelphia Association, and by their labors churches were organized, and were collected, and an Association formed. Now, let me tell you that the Philadelphia Baptists never sent a minister anywhere.

Then he makes another assertion that I want to read. Ray's Baptist Succession, page 30: "The Philadelphia Association, from the first, has engaged earnestly in efforts for the proper education of its ministers, and the spread of the

gospel in the world. Rhode Island College, now Brown University, received its patronage and contributions from its origin, as the subsequent minutes show. It will be seen also, that from the first it has been an effective missionary body. Hundreds of churches have been gathered by the able and self-denying men sent out at its expense to regions where no religious privileges had before been enjoyed."

What does Ray refer to here? Why, he referred to the minutes of the Philadelphia Baptist Association, page 5. When we come to look at that place, we find that it is in the preface, and not a part of the history at all. Mr. Ray tries to show that this has been a missionary body from the very first. But did not I prove yesterday from Benedict that the first missionary society organized among this people was organized in 1802, where he says that they would have sent out a missionary, but did not have a suitable man? Notwithstanding this, Mr. Ray asserts that it has been a flourishing missionary body from the first. Now, this book, called the Baptist Succession, was published, I believe, in 1872; and I know, in the portion of country where I live, I never heard of a Missionary Baptist in my life claiming that they were the Old Baptists until this work came into circulation in this country. They got the first idea from this book; and I assert that if Ray had not written and circulated his book, those Missionaries would never have found out or set up the claim that they were Old Baptists.

Now I will refer you to Gardner, page 22, and this book, I understand, is a Missionary Baptist work. He comes out and acknowledges that they and the Pedobaptists agree. "Of course, our denominational fellowship for others can extend only so far as we agree in faith and practice. With

some of them, as the Congregationalists, Methodists, and Presbyterians, we agree substantially in what is essential to salvation, however much we may differ as to baptism, communion, and church polity; and hence we can consistently co-operate with them *as christians* in the great work of conversion, and in whatever else we agree, though we cannot extend to them the *tokens* of church fellowship."

What is the reason they cannot agree with them all the way through? They assert that they agree with them substantially of what is necessary to every sinner. I want to show you the inconsistency of the Missionary Baptists here. The Methodists are much more consistent, for over in my country they unite together—the Presbyterians, Methodists, and Missionary Baptists—and have held protracted meetings, and profess to convert sinners; they work in harmony up to that point, and then they divide their converts, and the Methodists invite these brethren that have assisted in the conversion of these sinners to their communion. But what do the Missionary brethren do? Why, they set their communion table, and say to the Methodists, "Brethren, we have set our table, and now you must stand off; you cannot come to our communion table." Don't you see the inconsistency there? If they can come together in the work of converting sinners, why cannot they sit together at the communion table?

Mosheim, second volume, page 286: "The external forms of divine worship and ecclesiastical government, in the Arminian Church, are almost the same with those which are in use among the Presbyterians." Mosheim says it is all the same; and now, if the systems agree, if they agree substantially with Pedobaptists, let me ask, what is the reason for having two associations? When they agree so closely, what

is the reason they do not come together and form one denomination? Why don't the two denominations unite? Is it because they are too near kin to contract a lawful marriage?

Cox's History, page 436: "Here what the Mississippi Baptists say, as also a portion of the report on education, made to the Central Association, at its session with Mount Abben Church in 1852, namely:

" 'Believing that education, in its fullest extent of meaning, is one means of carrying on the work of the world's salvation, and that, as a body of the professed followers of Jesus Christ, it is our duty, &c.' It will be seen that by all these innovations there has been a great departure from original principles in doctrine when they talk of the world's salvation by means of education, leaving Christ out of the question."

I think no comment is necessary on that paragraph.

Wayland, second volume, page 172: "We are all looking too much to our own wisdom, and forgetting that there is any Holy Ghost. We are making a difference between the times of Christ and his Apostles, and our own times." He was a Missionary Baptist historian, and this is the confession he makes.

See page 254: "Dr. Wayland's eyes filled with tears, and his voice trembled as he said, 'O how near that man came to losing his soul!' It was\* this feeling that made his great heart burn with holy indignation as he saw so many of God's ministers engaged in everything besides saving souls." Now, I want to know if this is the business of the Lord Jesus Christ. I want to know if the Lord Jesus Christ has sent us out to engage in the business of the salvation of souls, or does that belong to the Lord Jesus Christ himself? Why, if we follow the testimony of the Bible we cannot admit that

that work belongs to us ; but we must admit that it belongs to the Lord Jesus Christ. And I take the position here now that every solitary gift necessary to the salvation of the sinner is the gift of God, and not in any degree the work of man. I say emphatically that everything necessary to the salvation of the sinner is the gift of God from first to last.

Now, brethren, is this the old Baptist doctrine or not ? I say this is what the old Baptists have ever preached and contended for. This is what the Old Baptists have been persecuted for, and this is what they have preached from the days of Christ and the Apostles down to the present time ; and I thank God that I am permitted to stand up here to-day before this intelligent congregation in vindication of the same truths that the Waldenses promulgated so long ago. I thank God that he has permitted me to stand here in defense of that truth.

[The Moderators announced that the speaker's time was up.]

---

#### REV. MR. WALLACE SAID:

GENTLEMEN Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: I come before you this morning, feeling better than ever. I heard once of some Irishmen who were raised in Cork, and who had heard tell of sheep being sheared, but they had never seen sheep nor seen one sheared ; they came to America and the first thing they saw was a white hog ; they put out and captured it and began shearing it, and a man passing by asked

them what they were doing; they replied, "We are sheep shearing." The man asked, "Are you getting much wool?" The reply was, "Not much wool, but a lot of noise." (Laughter.)

Now, in this debate, I must say I am getting much noise, but not much argument. Brother Hardy has said that I have not answered one of his arguments. Now, there has been a stenographer employed to report this discussion, and I believe it is to be published, and when it is the people can judge of that for themselves. Now, some of you who nodded so much for brother Hardy, just nod a little for me. I simply ask the people to judge whether I have or not, answered your argument; I have no fears as to the judgment.

Well, it seems I have not done with Coffey yet. He says he cannot find the statement in Coffey that I quoted. All I have to say is that I pity the comprehension of any man that cannot read it here; I pity any man that cannot understand this language. Here is Mr. Coffey berating the Missionary Baptists, and then he says to the Regular Baptist people that Jesus Christ came into the world to save his people from their sins—"that he"—who is he talking of? Christ, of course—"by his sufferings and death"—whose sufferings and death? Christ's—"that in his appointed time and way"—whose time? Why, Christ's time—"he will call, regenerate and sanctify them"—who will? Christ will—"in short, manifest himself"—that is, Christ will—"and that it is impossible they can refuse the call, did not manifest"—who did not manifest? Why, Christ. Who else is under consideration? I pity any man who cannot understand that. It is apparent to any man who knows anything about rhetoric or logic.

Mr. Hardy says you cannot understand who is in the affirmative and who in the negative, and repeats that I have not answered his first argument. So far as that is concerned, he ought to be glad of that, but the report of this debate will show whether that is so, or not.

Then he complains about some article in the *Paducah News*, and asserts that the writer of it was ashamed to put his name to it. Now, what was that done for? I tell this audience that these people have circulated it all over this country that I wrote that piece. I assert here solemnly that I did not write it. I, however, know the man who did write it, and he is a man that possesses more intelligence and knowledge of logic than Mr. Hardy could learn in ten years, even if he went to a theological school. I will pass on now.

And, said brother Hardy, it was a hundred years after the first association was formed before missionary operations commenced. Now, is it necessary to reply to that? I have quoted and given the pages in Benedict's works where it is shown that the Philadelphia Association was constituted in 1707, and I have shown from numerous passages in Benedict that missionary operations were carried on in 1755. But as there are, perhaps, a number of people here to-day who were not present yesterday, I will refer to one passage in order to show the falsity of that statement.

Benedict, page 707: "In the year 1755 the association, taking into consideration the destitute condition of many places in the interior settlements of this and the neighboring States (then Provinces), recommended to the churches to make contributions for the support of a missionary to itinerate in these parts. Mr. Hart was authorized and requested,

provided a sufficient sum should be raised, to procure, if possible, a suitable person for that purpose."

Mark, this was in 1775, while Mr. Hardy says there was no such thing until a hundred years after the formation of the first association in America, which would make it 1807; while Beebe says there was no such thing until 1811. Mr. Hardy seems to be unable to retain a fact in his memory from one day to the next; he certainly cannot retain it long enough to carry on a discussion. I don't charge him with willful perversion, for I believe he is honest; it must simply be a lack of memory.

Benedict, page 709: "This association has now existed ninety-six years, and during this long period it has been uniform in its principles and pursuits, having been under the management of men of intelligence and stability. Among its early doings it paid special attention to the cause of missions, ministerial education, and all benevolent institutions then patronized and promoted by evangelical christians.

"So deeply were they imbued with the spirit of missions that almost a hundred years since they sent more than a thousand miles for Rev. John Gano to become their missionary in destitute parts of their own State and North Carolina. He was appointed and supported in the same manner as missionaries are at the present time."

Now, I hope I will not have to recapitulate this again, in order to refute the reckless statements of my opponent. I know there are many men of discernment here who have come to listen impartially to the proof given on both sides, and I am content to rest that point here.

Next, Mr. Hardy had something to say about Sunday Schools. Now I know there are old Baptists here who have

found and heard of Sunday Schools among them fifty years before Mr. Hardy was born. Have you ever had one, brother Watkins? If they have not found Sunday Schools they have found prayer meetings. Now, I am satisfied there are men here who remember the wail of brother Worlds a few years ago when he said, "I would to God that Old Baptists had prayer meetings as they used to have." Right here is a minister that wished they did not have them, at New Hope a few years ago; I don't remember when it was that the association was held at New Hope, the time before the last, but there are parties here that heard that same statement. I ask you now, When did you get up a prayer meeting? Was it before brother Worlds made that statement?

Mr. Hardy—I don't know when he made that statement.

Mr. Wallace—When did you get up a prayer meeting in the Little River Association? How long has it been in existence?—two years?

Mr. Hardy—Ten of them.

Mr. Wallace—An organized prayer meeting?

Mr. Hardy—Yes; by the church.

Mr. Wallace—I see one of your members shaking his head. You have had prayer meetings, but as far as regularly organized prayer meetings are concerned, to pray for the salvation of sinners, I don't think you ever had it. That is the statement I made that you never did have a regularly organized prayer meeting, gotten up for that purpose.

I asked Mr. Hardy to tell this people how many brethren he had in Europe. He has not answered. I will speak of that after awhile. Not a word has been said by him about these questions.

Well, he says I cannot cross the Reformation with my sys-

tem. I reckon he wants me to go a little faster than I want to go. However, for his benefit, I will proceed to cross this morning. We will see who goes back of the Reformation, whether brother Hardy's people or mine. Well, brother Hardy, tell me when did the Reformation commence? I have no idea that Mr. Hardy knows; that is my notion of it, although I may be mistaken; because it is not everybody who knows when the Reformation did commence. The Reformation was commenced by Martin Luther in the year 1517. Can I take my system beyond that time? Mr. Hardy asserts that I cannot. I will leave this people to decide whether I do, or not. I promised this people before to-day that I would trace our system back into the Bible. Mr. Hardy complains that I do not look at the Bible, that I am much fonder of Coffey. We will see.

Before I proceed, I want to say that I am a predestinarian; I believe in God's predestination. Indeed I am a better predestinarian than Mr. Hardy, for I go the whole hog, while he only goes half.

Ray's Baptist Succession, page 38: "Again in the minutes of 1789 we have the following: 'After conferring upon the necessity and importance of raising a fund for the education of pious and promising young men for the ministry, we, the members present, do engage to promote subscriptions in our respective churches and congregations for said purpose, and to bring in the monies raised, with the subscription papers, to the next association, to be at their disposal.'"

Remember that was in the year 1789.

On page 39 of the same book we find they had a college established under the patronage of Broad Mead Church, and that it went into operation in the year 1710.

Now, on page 40 of the same book: "In the year 1229 the Waldenses had already spread themselves throughout all Italy. They had ten schools in Valcanonica alone, and they sent money from all parts of their abode in Lombardy for the maintenance and support of said schools."

So, Mr. Hardy, if that is so, do not repudiate such schools; do not calumniate them. Here are a people that supported theological institutions in 1229, and who sent money from all parts of their country for the support of them. Now, does not every man who knows your prescriptive policy against such as this, know that these were not antimission Baptists that did this? O, they say, but that is not all, and they ridicule us because we support the Bible Society and the Orphans' Home. One of their ministers made light of it at their association meeting, when we made up a fund for these orphans—poor creatures with neither father, mother nor friend to take care of them. I told them yesterday that they would exclude members from their churches if they contributed to the support of such an institution. Aye, if one of their members should give a dollar to this great Bible Society that does such a magnificent work for humanity, he is put out of church for the act. Some of them might give one dollar for the missionary work, but they are told they shall not do it; but there is nothing said if they spend their money to their own ruin and the demoralization of the youth of the country. When I attack them on this they burn under it, and make no attempt at refuting it. And yet here we find the existence and support of such institutions long before they ever had an existence. I will show this audience that these antimissionaries never have practiced the principles of the ancient Baptists. I have said that when I came to the Bible I

would show the existence of protracted meetings, missions and a financial agent; I will show you churches in those days that were engaged in the glorious work of sending the gospel to the heathens.

I have crossed the Reformation, though I have skipped a good deal of history, but I promise to supply the connecting links in the chain when I begin my argument in assuming the burden of proof.

Now, I will sum up shortly the argument of yesterday and the day before, for the benefit of those present who were not present before.

I brought up the charges made on Mr. Hardy's people by his own brother, Dr. Watson, to which there has been no attempt at an answer. Next, I reviewed Coffey's history, and Elder Beebe's, and I showed that both of these had made statements that were untrue. I asserted that Beebe was one of their leading men and ablest writers. I charged as false the statements of Coffey as to what we preached, and defied any one to say they had ever heard such doctrine preached. Finally one of these people got up and gave Dr. Chaplin, of Texas, as one. Now, Dr. Chaplin is a man that wears the title of D. D., which is a mark of literary distinction, and consequently he is a man that is sound in the doctrine of the Baptists, and he would not have preached it. I heard brother Spencer speak of it, and say that Dr. Chaplin denied it.

Mr. Spencer offered to state what Dr. Chaplin said on the subject in his presence.

Mr. Moderator Perkins objected to such a statement as wholly unnecessary.

Mr. Wallace resumed—I will just say to this audience that

brother Spencer will indorse what I have said. I will at the first opportunity write a postal card to Dr. Chaplin in reference to the matter, and his reply will settle the question as to which of these two men has made the correct statement. Nearly everybody over the country takes this paper, and I will have the Doctor's reply published. If Dr. Chaplin had been some greenhorn that did not know any better what our doctrine is, I might have believed it. I know that there are some men in our denomination who really do not know what our doctrine is; that is the case in every denomination, but the denomination is not responsible for them.

Now, I will go back a little. Mr. Hardy has said that it was a hundred years after the Philadelphia Association was constituted before missionism was commenced. I have spoken of that. If you will refer to Fuller's History, page 84, you will find that Princeton College in 1795 conferred the degree of D. D. on Andrew Fuller. Elder Beebe says he joined the church in 1801, and he says such a thing was not known among Baptists in the United States in 1805. Yale College also conferred the degree of D. D. on Andrew Fuller, six years before Beebe joined the church, and yet he tells his brethren there was nothing like that known among the people at that time. What does this people think of such a man who would mislead his brethren in order to cry down the Missionary Baptists? He had no other object. It could not have been ignorance on Beebe's part, because graduates went there to study when the split took place in Maryland, at Black Rock, and preached there. And Brown's University stands there to-day in successful operation that was constituted in 1664, and consequently that was before Beebe joined the church. McWalter's Academy existed in 1755, and was

in successful operation for twelve years, and yet Beebe makes these statements, and no attempt has been made to vindicate him. Still they say I won't answer anything.

---

ELDER HARDY SAID:

GENTLEMEN Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: It seems that brother Wallace or myself misunderstand the reading of this language in Coffey's History very much.

He evidently wishes to make the impression on this people that I have made a false statement in regard to the mission system. Now, if it is false the Missionary Baptists made it, and not me. Did not I prove here on yesterday that the first missionary society that was ever formed, was formed in the year 1792? and Mr. Wallace has not disproved that statement. I produced three witnesses to testify to that effect, and he says they are Missionary Baptists. Now, did not I prove from Benedict, the second volume, that the first missionary society was organized in the Philadelphia Baptist Association in 1802? and he says they would have sent out a missionary, but did not have a suitable man. This is what Benedict says; and if he has contradicted himself, it is not my fault. I also quoted from the Little River Association of United Baptists, where they positively state that the first missionary that was sent out in America was in 1812. I am not responsible for their works.

Then Mr. Wallace refers to Sunday Schools, and says that it is my business to prove that we were what the ancient

Baptists were. When was the first Sunday School? In 1781, which is quite ancient; consequently he says we are not on the original ground, because we have no Sunday School. So far as the first Sunday School being organized in 1781, we do not deny that. The question is, Did the Baptists have these previous to that time? I say they did not; and if that is true, it shows that there was a departure from the original principles there.

Then he says that I had remarked several times that he could not cross the Reformation, and he went back and found the existence of schools of the Waldenses, and then states that the Old Baptists were opposed to such schools. In short, he wishes to make the impression on this people that the Old Baptists were opposed to education, and that they were ignorant and illiterate. I may remark here that it is a fact that a good deal of the education Mr. Wallace has he got from an Old Baptist; and I expect that there are some men in the Old Baptist Church to-day that are able to teach him a good deal yet. We do not deny that the Waldenses had these schools, and I do not deny that he can go behind the Reformation and find these schools; but is that any part of the doctrine of the Baptists, or is it a part of the doctrine of anybody? If I have not made the statement before, I do it now, that neither brother Wallace, nor any other man, can set up the doctrine and practice of the Missionary Baptists and trace it beyond the Reformation on the pages of history. I do not mean merely of schools, but I mean that they cannot set up their system as they believe and preach it to-day, that they cannot trace back their practice as they practice it in this portion of Kentucky. If they can do it, let them show it on the pages of history. I repeat, he cannot do it.

Mr. Wallace has been claiming since this discussion commenced that his denomination excluded us. Now, we will see about that during this my half hour's speech.

Mr. Wallace—Mr. Hardy has made use of that expression again. I do not want to interrupt him, but I want to say that my understanding is that the Old Baptists claim that they excluded us.

Mr. Hardy—I understand that you excluded us.

Mr. Wallace—I wish to say that I never made any such statement here or anywhere else. I never have claimed that we excluded you, and I am not here for the purpose of setting that up. I make the statement that you seceded from us, and I will prove it before this discussion is ended.

Mr. Hardy—Very well. Now, taking up my line of argument I will refer you to Benedict, page 893:

“1. THE CAMPBELLITES, OR REFORMERS.—Many churches were divided by this reformation.

“2. THE COMMENCEMENT OF THE MISSIONARY AGE.—This caused another war, and the division of many churches and associations.”

Benedict, page 802: “Red River Association was formed from the Cumberland, in 1806; it took its name from a river which rises in Kentucky, and empties into the Cumberland a little below Clarksville. The churches to the east and south-east of this river, and the Dividing Ridge between it and the Cumberland, remained in the old body; those on the other side united in the new interest.

“The community embraced some of the oldest churches in what was then called West Tennessee; and so great was its enlargement that when my tables were made up for 1812 it stood a fraction highest on the list, as to numerical

strength, of any association in the whole State. But its boundaries and strength are so greatly reduced that it now numbers but a fraction over three hundred. It is located in the county of Montgomery, and perhaps some others in this State. One or more of its churches are in Kentucky.

“The Bethel Association, which stands at the head of the whole corps of the institutions of the kind in Kentucky save one, went out from the Red River some twenty years since; it will be noticed under the head of that State.”

Here is the positive statement of Benedict that the Bethel Association went out from the Red River Association, not that the Red River Association went out from the Bethel. Is not that clear and explicit language? He says distinctly that the Bethel Association went out from the Red River; and this division took place in 1824, according to the statement of Mr. Benedict, and the Bethel Association was organized in that year.

Benedict, page 830: “Bethel Association bears date from 1824. This is the largest body of the kind in the State, except from Elkhorn. This is a strong branch of the Red River fraternity; it was formed by a division of it at the time above named. This fact I learn from Allen’s Register for 1833,” &c.

Benedict, page 829: “Little River Association was formed in 1813; it was taken from the old Red River community, which is partly in Tennessee, under the head of which State I have placed it.

“Elders Dudley Williams, D. Brown, J. F. Woods and Nathan Ross were the principal preachers in the formation of this then new interest. It comprised twenty-seven churches, twelve ordained preachers, and one thousand eight hundred and nine members. It was located in the west of Kentucky

and Tennessee, and in the southern part of the Territories of Illinois and Missouri. The Highland, Kentucky and Muddy River Associations in Illinois, and some others, have been constituted from it.

“This association split in 1833.”

Now see Coffey, page 40; and I will say that I know that the statement contained here is true, because I saw the association book, and got a copy of the proceedings of the association; and my brother Watkins, who is here, says that he also saw the minutes, and they were like it is here. “In 1833; at which time the association met at Mt. Pleasant meeting house, Trigg County, Kentucky, and was organized by choosing Elder William Buckley Moderator, and John Draper Clerk. The original body (we mean by this those who held the Constitution and Articles of Faith sacred, and wished no innovation either in faith or practice), knowing that there were two parties among them, first made the following motion, viz.: ‘I motion that all who cannot fellowship the doctrine of general atonement and universal operation of the Spirit, manifest it by holding up their hands.’ On this vote there was a majority declared they did not fellowship the above doctrines, and a large minority voted that they did. Then a second motion was presented, viz.: ‘I motion that all those that cannot retain in fellowship those that preach and believe the doctrine of general atonement and universal operation of the Spirit, manifest it by rising to their feet and collecting themselves together, and organize themselves as the Little River Association, to the *exclusion* of those that believe the above doctrines contrary to the Constitution.’” I repeat that this is the statement of the association book itself.

Mr. Rose said that he had the minutes referred to at his house, and would produce them if Mr. Wallace desired them.

Mr. Wallace—Allow me to make one remark. In the first place, there is no use of my bringing up that question again. I have proved that this is not true, and you will remember when I called on them yesterday to let me see the minutes that they objected to it. I don't care to raise that question again. I have proved emphatically that this is not the case.

Mr. Hardy resumed—I would beg the gentleman not to interrupt me again, as it confuses me, and breaks my line of thought.

I will now refer to Coffey, page 59: "As touching the third and fourth exceptions, as charged in the declaration of dropping the correspondence with the Little River Association, and adopting one with the Original Little River Association, neither dropped nor adopted a correspondence at the last sitting, as may be seen from her minutes, that she continued her correspondence as formerly with the Original Little River Association, finding her occupying her old landmarks that she was constituted upon, and the seceding party occupying a different one, which this association do not feel disposed to fellowship." We find the Highland and Muddy River Associations using correspondence previous to the division of the Little River Association, and when the division took place there had been no division in either of these associations, and they continued to correspond with the Old Baptists. Now, why did they do it if we were a split up party? Here came up a query in the Bethel Association, and brother Coffey says that they neither dropped out nor adopted a correspondence, but continued in the same body that they had corresponded with before.

I refer you now to Benedict, page 860: "Salem Association was formed by a seceding party from the old one last named, in 1833, on account of her noneffort principles." Now, here is another positive declaration of Benedict's that they seceded from the old one last named.

Benedict, page 828: "Highland Association was formed in 1819; this is a body of some age, but in a very feeble condition; relative to its history I have no information, except that it came out of the old Little River community. This is one of the seceding parties on the missionary question, which are somewhat common in this region. It is very small, and in a declining state; the counties of Henderson, Union and Hopkins embrace most of its churches. Little Bethel Association bears date from 1835." Here we see that Bethel was formed from the Highland Association, and I will read what Benedict says about it: "Little Bethel Association bears date from 1835; it was formed by a seceding party from the one last named, in consequence of the intolerant measures of the mother body against all benevolent efforts." What does Mr. Benedict admit here? Does not he say positively that they seceded from the mother body? I told you that brother Wallace could not prove that they are older than their "mammy."

After this Highland Association had been organized for sixteen years, the division took place, but the Highland Association went right straight along, and the Little Bethel Association was formed from it; and we find by referring to the minutes of the Highland Association and Little Bethel Association that the Highland Association is sixteen years older than the Little Bethel. Mr. Wallace says that the latter is the older.

Benedict, page 796: "Highwasee Association No. 2, which was organized in 1836; and it is on the same ground, and is composed for the most part of men who had belonged to the mother body." What does Mr. Benedict mean when he uses the expression, "mother body?" He says that they belonged "to the mother body," and I am clearly of the opinion that he meant exactly what he said.

Benedict, page 854: "Franklin Association was formed in October, 1841, with seven churches and eight ordained ministers, whose names were," &c. "This new interest came out from the Bethel Association, on account of her opposition to benevolent operations. The reasons for this secession from the mother body are thus expressed," &c. Is not that also conclusive proof that they seceded from the mother body? Now, my brethren, remember that this is the testimony of a Missionary Baptist himself, and not of an Old Baptist, and I would like to see Mr. Wallace come up here and say they are untrue.

Coffey, page 97. Here is the testimony of a living witness who was present at the time of the division referred to. "I know for myself, being personally present at the separation, that the United Baptists are the split off, and stand as the excluded party." This is the evidence of a man who knew the names of all the Missionary Baptists who split off and stand as the excluded party. Does it look reasonable that a man would come up here, before all the witnesses were dead that were present at the time the Missionary Baptists were born, and claim that they were older than their mother? Not only does this witness testify to these facts, but there are plenty of other witnesses that will prove the same thing.

There was a Campbellite minister that was present at the last discussion, who, if he were here, I could produce as a witness, and prove who the Old Baptists were. He said it had been always understood that we were the old Baptists, and that it was something new when it was first disputed. Does not everybody know that away back there they always called us the Old Baptists, said that we were "old fogies," and that we were a hundred years behind the times? And when we refer back a hundred years or so, we find that the old Baptists stood on the very principles we stand on to-day. He acknowledges that himself, and says that the Old Baptists have not disclaimed the general doctrine of the Baptists, nor changed, nor made any departure. Now, if their own historian admits this, I hardly think that the Missionary Baptists can deny it; for certainly Belcher, who lived long ago, had better chances of knowing about these things than they have to-day.

Now, will Mr. Wallace say that I have not proved that his people went out from us? I told you yesterday in regard to these Separate Baptists, and now we see away back there in 1740 that there rose up a new denomination, which came from the Presbyterians, and who were called, in the first place, "New Lights," and then "Separate Baptists." And we find afterwards that there was a union took place in 1787; and when these people united with us the Regular Baptists had objection to it, because they held the principles of Arminianism, and, indeed, they came up squarely and admitted they did, but they asserted that they were good pious men and so on. The Separate Baptists did not accuse the Regular Baptists of having Arminianism in their ranks, but the Regular Baptists accused the Separates of having Arminianism

in their ranks, but they said they were good pious men; and let me tell you, since we opened our doors to receive these people, to receive people with Arminianism in their ranks, we have never been united, because one party believed in general atonement and the general application of the Spirit, and the other party believed in special atonement and special application of the Spirit.

Brother Wallace has had a great deal to say about the articles of faith, but he has admitted that the articles of faith set forth the doctrine and sentiments that the Baptists believe. Well, if these articles of faith set forth the doctrine and sentiments that the Baptists believed in those times, do they not set forth the doctrine and sentiments that the Missionary Baptists believe to-day? Now, I have got the articles of faith of the Missionary Baptists, and I purpose to read them before this discussion is over.

As I have a little more time, I will read the articles of faith of the Red River Association of 1819:

"1. We believe in one only true and living God, the Father, the Word, and Holy Ghost.

"2. We believe that the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are the word of God, and the only rule of faith and practice.

"3. We believe in the doctrine of original sin.

"4. We believe in the doctrine of election, and that God chose his people in Christ before the foundation of the world.

"5. We believe in man's impotency to recover himself from the fallen state he is in by nature of his own free will and ability.

"6. We believe that sinners are justified in the sight of God only by the imputed righteousness of Christ.

"7. We believe that God's elect shall be called, converted, regenerated and sanctified by the Holy Spirit.

"8. We believe that the saints shall persevere in grace, and never fall finally away.

"9. We believe that Baptism and the Lord's Supper are ordinances of Jesus Christ, and that true believers are the subjects; and we believe that the true mode of baptism is by immersion.

"10. We believe in the resurrection of the dead and a general judgment.

"11. We believe that the punishment of the wicked and the joys of the righteous will be eternal.

"12. We believe that no ministers have a right to the administration of the ordinances only such as are regularly baptized, called, and come under the imposition of hands by the presbytery," &c.

These are the articles of faith of the Red River Association of 1819. It represents the sentiments and doctrine of the Baptists at that time. Now, if the Baptists ever believed what the Missionary Baptists now believe, what are they doing with the articles of faith they have now? The people of this portion of the country know that the Missionary Baptists do not preach the articles of faith that lie before me. They know that they do not preach that God chose his people in Christ before the foundation of the world. They know that they do not preach that the elect shall be called, regenerated and sanctified by the Holy Spirit of God. If they believe that, why don't they unite with us? What is the necessity of our being divided if such is the case? Everybody within the sound of my voice knows that the Regular Baptists preach these very sentiments and doctrine to-day; and

if the Baptists preached the same thing back in those days previous to the division, when we were all united on these articles of faith, tell me what was the necessity of any division. You all know that they preached contrary to the articles of faith set forth here, else there would never have been a division among them. And here came in this trouble about tract societies and Sunday Schools, and other things that were not contained here; and consequently we could not get along together, and we divided.

---

REV. MR. WALLACE SAID:

GENTLEMEN Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: I still keep getting better. The time will come after dinner when I will unfurl my flag and throw it to the breeze, and before this discussion closes it will have inscribed upon it, "Victory!"

Ladies and gentlemen, give me your attention for a short time, while I repeat the questions I put to brother Hardy on Monday morning, as there are some here who were not present when I first propounded them. I told him to get all his theological talent together and bring it to bear on these questions, and I gave him two days and a half in which to answer them. He has not answered one of them, nor has he made any attempt to do so. No, he could not collect enough theological talent to answer them. Now, it seems to me if I was debating with a man, and he submitted a series of questions for me to answer, I would do it, or acknowledge that I could not answer them. Here are my questions:

First. Where did you have a separate denomination prior to the year 1832?

Second. How many Baptists were there in the United States when the separation commenced?

Third. How many, in 1840, when the separation ended? The separation commenced in Virginia in 1832, and ended in Illinois in 1840. He says he excluded us from his church, and I asked him,

Fourth. How many did you exclude from the church?

Fifth. How many of your denomination have you in Europe?

Sixth. Who first brought the gospel to America?

Seventh. What makes the difference between the people of America and the heathen nations?

Eighth. Did you ever have a missionary on any plan whatever? If so, in what church and what association? I have spoken of the Fulkerson missionary operation, and how he was sent to Kansas to organize a church, and his expenses, fifty dollars, paid. You say missionism accomplishes nothing; why did you expend fifty dollars for nothing?

Ninth. Had you ever a theological school, seminary, Bible or tract society, organized prayer meeting, or protracted meeting?

Tenth. Did you ever have a general association?

Eleventh. Were we the church of Christ when we were united?

Twelfth. Are the words "repent" and "believe," as commanded by Jesus Christ, in the active or passive voice?

Thirteenth. What is condemnation? Is it the decree of God to finally condemn? I will say here, that the great difference between us is on this point. While they preach dam-

nation by the unalterable decree of God, we preach damnation by works.

Fourteenth. What is the cause of a sinner's damnation? Is it because God is unwilling to save the sinners? Mr. Hardy will not answer that question, because it is diametrically opposed to his doctrine.

Fifteenth. Was there a portion of the human family reprobated from eternity?

These are all the questions submitted to him on Monday morning, and the time in which he had to answer them having expired, I will, after the recess, proceed to answer them myself, and I will leave him so far behind that he will be nowhere. You saw how Mr. Hardy and his brethren stood around with long faces discussing these questions, and I understand there was an agreement made that he should not attempt it. I will reach back, and show him whether there were no missionary operations back of the Reformation; I will reach Bible testimony and show it. I went back and showed the existence of theological schools, and he now comes up and says, O, common schools; of course you can show them! Everybody knows that these people heap vituperations on theological schools, and on those who give money to support them. Do people send money to support common schools? Every man with any comprehension, and with his reason enthroned, knows that these were not common schools, nor for common education. Mr. Hardy and his people say that when James said, "If any man lack wisdom let him ask of God," that that is education. I have heard a man preach, who said when he began, "My mind is as blank as a piece of paper." What did he mean by that? Why, "If God does not fill it I cannot say anything." Well, I

thought as he proceeded that God did not understand good language. I am utterly unable to understand how a man can make such a remark that man made. Paul studied, he said, and God's divine Spirit assisted him in the study of the word; consequently he was able to bring it out as God intends it shall be done. And these people heap their vituperations on these institutions for the instruction of youth in God's holy word, and say, O, they were common schools; but they know very well that these were not common schools.

Then Mr. Hardy takes up this Little River Association business, and tries to prove me a story-teller about that. I said what I wanted to prove on them and did not want to take up any more time with it. Brother Rose says now he has that minute. I would like to ask him if it is the minute of the meeting at the time of the split.

Mr. Rose—It is the minute having reference to the division.

Mr. Wallace—I have one here furnished by my friend, Thomas Harrison, and here I have a statistical table giving the number of associations last year. It shows you had four hundred in the entire association. Now, if your minute is according to this, it has got a table showing the number at that time.

Mr. Rose—I cannot say whether it is or not.

Mr. Wallace—You could look and see.

Now, Little River Association split, as I said before, in 1833, and here is what Benedict says about it. Benedict, page 829:

“A communication from Rev. Joel Grace, 1846. This industrious correspondent has sent me the minutes of this body for a number of years past, and has given me the details of

the troubles which Little River No. 2 [which is Mr. Hardy's order] has caused it, more fully than my limits will permit me to insert. It appears to be a strong and vigorous community, which has stood its ground against severe opposition from the anti party."

Then Benedict, under the head of "Little River Association," says:

"This association split in 1833 on the missionary question, and a new and small interest claiming the name and constitution of the original body was formed from it."

Benedict calls them a new and small interest. The minutes show at the present time that our body is four thousand five hundred and twenty-nine strong, and it is the master association in the State of Kentucky, and has been for years. It was the master association at the time of the division, and I assert that the minority did split off, and not the majority, as Mr. Hardy has tried to prove by Coffey, whom I have proved is a dishonest historian. And I will hazard the assertion that Mr. Hardy never had a thousand in his association in his life. I assert that at the split, the Little River Association had two thousand one hundred and seventeen, and I repeat that the other never had a thousand, and I defy them to prove to the contrary. Now, I think that ought to settle this question. I dropped it yesterday, and if Mr. Hardy had let it alone I would not have referred to it again.

Now, gentlemen, I made this remark on Monday morning, and I stand by it to-day. If I have to come here to gain a victory, or to present what I believe to be the truth to this people, and have to do it on nothing but error, God knows I would quit this discussion. I have too honest a heart for that. I never came here with that purpose, and if I make a

misrepresentation at any time here, it will be an error of the head and not of the heart.

Mr. Hardy then quotes what Benedict has to say about secession. I admit that is true. I know that in some of their associations they did have a majority, and that in some of their associations they did force us out, and I will show that in Benedict's works. I am not here to deny that there was not one of your associations that had a majority, because I know better than that. I know some of your associations did exclude us. But on the other hand, I will show you emphatically numbers of churches that never had any trouble in them at all, and that were never anything but Missionary Baptists, and they stand united to-day with us. And while all of brother Hardy's party was united with us, and at the time of the trouble, as I told you yesterday, one of their charges against us was that we were in alliance with the Abolitionists of the North, and that all we wanted was to get the reins of the Government in our hands. Now, you all know there were more Baptists up North in 1832. How many people were in Jackson's Purchase at that time? I know brother Bolton and my father rode ten miles to a log raising, and Jackson's Purchase had but few people in 1832. Does not everybody know that throughout the States where there were separations in 1832 the country was hardly settled, and it was in the Southern States that the trouble came up, where there were but few historians? I will show you that where the great body of Baptists were there never was any trouble; and there are a great many men who never heard of the anti-mission Baptists. I will show you Separate Baptists that were thousands stronger than these Old Baptists, as they are called, ever were in their lives.

Then, Mr. Hardy says I have a great deal to say about articles of faith. Now, I appeal to this audience to say which of us it is that has had so much to say about that. Has it been I or Mr. Hardy that has been harping on articles of faith? Is not this audience composed of ladies and gentlemen of discernment? Does Mr. Hardy think you have been idling about here and not listening to the discussion, and does he think to impose on you? Have not I submitted the question to him and challenged him to answer whether his order made articles of faith a test of fellowship? And he has charged us with having changed our articles of faith. Now, I propose to show that, on the contrary, he has changed his. And right here let me ask this question: When a man or a denomination finds he or it is wrong, is it not the part of honesty to change to the right? When a man makes a statement that is untrue, should he not retract it? A man who will not change when he knows he is wrong is either a bigoted fool or a knave. Change is the law of nature. And if we as a denomination have changed some things in our articles of faith that we believed were wrong, were we not right and honest in so doing? Why, our Methodist brethren have changed their discipline time and again, and yet will you say that the Methodist Church of to-day is not the same Methodist Church it was many years ago? Don't you know, brother Hardy, that your church has changed its discipline time and again, and yet are you not the same church as of old? And will it be maintained that because the Baptists have changed some of their articles of faith, they are not now Baptists? A man who honestly believes he is wrong, will surely change, and I will obligate myself here to-day that if brother Hardy can convince me

that he is right, and that he teaches the true doctrine, I will not stand still for wife or children or family associations, but will go right over to his side. I do not say I may not do wrong; it is human to err, and he who maintains that he can do no wrong must have his reason disenthroned.

Now, just a few words on the subject of election. I regret to have to make the charge that Mr. Hardy has misrepresented me here, when he said our people abused the doctrine of election and made sport of it. But he did so. Our people know better than to do anything of the kind. There is no people that believes more in the doctrine of election by grace than we do. He has tried to leave the impression on the minds of this people that we preached salvation by works, and I have asked him to avow that, for under the rules I am not allowed to charge it on him until he avows it, and he will not do it. Notwithstanding he has endeavored to make that impression. Now, the great difference between them and us is that we preach salvation by grace and damnation by works, while they preach salvation by grace and damnation by the decrees of God. Now, the Two-Seed doctrine is that God made his people and the devil made the rest, and that God will in the end get his people and the devil will get his. This arrangement is made by mutual consent, I presume, between God and the devil. Mr. Hardy's doctrine, however, is that God made all the people, and that he sent his Son to die for a few. They maintain that Christ died to save the few, and let the devil have all the rest. But I learn from the Bible that God is no respecter of persons, and I suppose, according to Mr. Hardy, he would give Christ to the devil as well as the idiots. It was certainly a generous arrangement of God's, by which he took for himself the very few.

and handed the balance over to the devil. These were not known, it would seem, in the covenant of redemption, and God gave them no chance in the start. They are not subjects of gospel address, it is said, and cannot hear the gospel. This is their preaching, and everybody here knows it is their doctrine. And believing this, they heap their vituperations on us because of our missionary work. They say we want to convert the world faster than God wishes it, and consequently they cast their calumniations, vituperations and vilifications upon us. Why, they can hardly preach a sermon without attacking the Missionary Baptists.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, I am through, and after dinner I will take up and discuss these questions, and I will stick to history until to-morrow at noon, when I will come to the Bible, and show all I have asserted.

[Afternoon Session.]

I WISH to say to this congregation (having said before that if I made any statement where I was wrong I would gladly take it back), that upon a reconsideration and close inspection of this extract I made from Coffey, I am satisfied that the author did not mean the construction that I put upon it. The mistake on my part occurred through the manner of punctuating the sentence. On closer inspection I find that it means that the regular Baptists had no anxiety for the salvation of the sinner. I acknowledge my error, and all I have to ask is, that when my opponent commits a mistake that he will as readily avow it.

ELDER HARDY SAID:

GENTLEMEN Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: I am again before you to renew the discussion. I would just remark, in the first place, in reference to the questions propounded to me by Mr. Wallace at the beginning of this discussion, that I do not think in such a debate as this I am required to answer such questions in order to prove my proposition. I do not understand that it is any part of my duty to answer any of these questions. So far as the questions themselves are concerned, I can readily answer them; but I do not think that I ought to take up time from the regular line of my argument to do so.

Mr. Wallace has made the charge that there was an agreement between some of my brethren and myself that I should not answer his questions. Now, before God, if there was ever any such an agreement I never heard of it.

He then claims that he has found the existence of schools previous to the Reformation. So far as this is concerned I propose to beat him on that point.

Referring to Orchard, page 65, we find the following:

“The first, and the most fatal of all events to the primitive religion, was the setting up of a christian academy at Alexandria. Christians had been reproached with illiteracy, and this seemed a plausible method to get rid of the scandal.”

The statement here made is, that it was the most fatal of all events to primitive religion. Now, it seems that this school that was organized back in those days proved to be

fatal to the religion of Jesus Christ. I again remark that I never have understood that the Regular Baptists were opposed to schools, but if I understand the Regular Baptists correctly on that subject they did not see proper to educate their ministers to preach to the uneducated people. So far as I am concerned I would to God that the people were educated.

Wayland, second volume, page 280: "He prepared, in 1861, a tract entitled 'How to be Saved,' which was published by the American Tract Society, Boston, and was widely circulated. A year or two later, an honored minister, residing at the West, wrote to him, 'I was lately at B., Ill., on a Sabbath, when a man and his wife were baptized, and united with the Baptist Church. I learned that they owned a farm out upon one of the prairies, and attended no place of worship, feeling no interest in religion. Our excellent sister F. gave the woman a copy of your tract, 'How to be Saved,' and it was blessed of God to the conversion of herself and her husband. I have heard of many similar cases.'"

Now, tell me if the Baptists of old had such tracts as these and circulated them. Does history show anywhere that these tracts were the means of salvation of sinners? Is such conversion as this salvation by Christ? We are told here that the proclamation of the gospel is the means of the salvation of sinners. It is stated here that these people had not attended any religious meetings, they had done nothing, and it is asserted that this little tract alone was the means of their conversion. I have got another little tract here; it is not as big as the other, but it has perhaps done as much as the other has done. It is said in this tract that they have

no doubt but that the world will be evangelized. Of that I must say that I am doubtful after reading the Bible.

Wayland, page 288: "I fear that many enter the ministry who have little idea that the great object is to rescue souls from hell by leading them to Christ."

Here it is said that the mission of the minister is to save souls from hell. Is that our mission in the world? Was that the mission of the Apostles? Was that what Christ came into the world to do? The Bible says that Christ came into the world to save people from their sins, and I tell you that that is the mission we have to perform. It does seem to me that the people of this day have forgotten the Bible spirit. It seems to me that the people have forgotten what Christ came into the world to do. Jesus said, "I laid down my life for the sheep." Does brother Wallace agree with that, that Christ laid down his life for the sheep? No, Mr. Wallace says that Christ laid down his life for the goats, although so far he has not been able to prove it. When you come to talk about the salvation of sinners the Bible tells you that that is the work of Christ. Here is the word: "I will take away from the sinner his stony heart, and I will give him a heart of flesh."

Wayland, second volume, page 325: "The same is true among missionaries. In this country and in India the whole effort is to dress up Jesus Christ so that we may not be ashamed of him when we meet him in respectable society."

Now, I ask brother Wallace if it is the mission of his people in the world to dress up Jesus Christ in order that they may not be ashamed of him when they go into respectable society.

In Mosheim, second volume, page 280, we find the articles

of faith of the Arminians, and I will here quote them: "That God, from all eternity, determined to bestow salvation on those who, as he foresaw, persevere to the end in their faith in Christ Jesus, and to inflict everlasting punishments on those who should continue in their unbelief, and resist, to the end of life, his divine succor:

"That Jesus Christ, by his death and sufferings, made an atonement for the sins of mankind in general, and of every individual in particular; that, however, none but those who believe in him can be partakers of that divine benefit.

"That true faith cannot proceed from the exercise of our natural faculties and powers, or from the force and operation of free will, since man, in consequence of his natural corruption, is incapable either of thinking or doing any good thing; and that therefore it is necessary to his conversion and salvation, that he be regenerated and renewed by the operation of the Holy Ghost, which is the gift of God, through Jesus Christ.

"That this divine grace, or energy of the Holy Ghost, which heals the disorders of a corrupt nature, begins, advances, and brings to perfection everything that can be called good in man; and that, consequently, all good works, without exception, are to be attributed to God alone, and to the operation of his grace; that, nevertheless, this grace does not force the man to act against his inclination, but may be resisted and rendered ineffectual by the perverse will of the impenitent sinner."

Here we see that James Arminius believed in the doctrine of general atonement. We have shown from the pages of history that this system began after the Reformation, and

that James Arminius first preached that system, and it has continued to be preached from that day to this. We have no account whatever of the Baptists ever having believed or preached any such thing previous to the Reformation; and when we come to trace up the articles of faith, we find that they agree, that they are the same to-day as they were then, and they set forth the doctrine and sentiments of the Baptists as they were held then and as they are held now. Then here is the doctrine of the Baptists contrary to the articles of faith that I have read here as set forth by the Arminians.

I have a roll of minutes here that I want all of these people to look at. They look like Old Baptists' minutes, of course. These minutes were made before the division of the Baptists. I have examined these minutes and there is one here as far back as 1804, but I do not see anywhere in these minutes where the Baptists in those days had a Sunday School, or a tract society, or a missionary board, or anything of that sort. Now, if the Baptists practiced this thing previous to the division, what is the reason they did not state it? When you examine the minutes of the Missionary Baptists, what do you see? Why, you see them filled up with these things which are not to be found in the minutes of the Baptists previous to the division.

Here, for instance, are the minutes of the Saludia Association of 1804, with eighteen churches, and their expenses \$26.77. From this I should think that if they sent out missionaries then that it was done very cheaply indeed.

Next, I examine the minutes of the Red River Association of 1823 (which was also previous to the division), and I find that there were then in that association thirty churches, and

the amount of money expended in defraying the expenses of these churches was \$35.75.

Minutes Bethel Association of 1827. Churches fifteen; expenses, \$23.75.

Minutes of the Little River Association of 1828. Churches, twenty; expenses, \$29.82½. Remember these are all minutes of debts previous to the division of the Baptists, and you see from them that there was not a great amount of money spent among the Baptists in that day.

Now, let us see, if in that respect, the Missionary Baptists are on the same platform and have the same principles that these Baptists had.

Here are the minutes of the Little River Association of United Baptists of 1869. They show that their expenses were \$1,811.20.

Minutes of the Little River Association of United Baptists of 1876. Expenses, \$2,791.90. Our minutes of 1877 show that our expenses were \$21.30.

So, in that respect, we are certainly on the old ground still. We are on the ground of the old Baptists so far as the expenditure of money is concerned. We acknowledge that it takes a great deal more money nowadays to run the machinery of these associations than it did away back there. They have certainly increased largely, for they have now great revivals among them, by which they increase their numbers wonderfully, they say. They spend a great deal of money; and if they could just succeed in converting them and making them hold out it would be a great thing, but we all know how many of these converts fall away. And it seems to me that if that was God's plan it would not be such a failure as it is. I have here before me a paper (the

*Baptist Watchman*, of date February 7, 1880) which contains a communication written by a Missionary Baptist, a part of which I will quote:

“We glory in the growing influence, prosperity and increase, which has characterized our history as a denomination. It sounds grand to say that one hundred thousand were received through baptism by our churches in the United States last year. But it it does not sound so grand to tell that the number of exclusions reached the appalling figure of thirty thousand, and that without very strict discipline either.”

Thirty thousand exclusions! Nearly one-third of the whole number of converts, and that, too, as we are informed, “without a very strict discipline.” Think what it would be if a strict discipline was enforced.

I refer here now to the minutes of the Missionary Baptists to show their increases and decreases. The minutes of the Little Bethel Association of 1876 show an increase of two hundred and seventeen, and a decrease of two hundred and four; net gain, thirteen. The minutes of the Union United Baptists of 1871 show an increase of one hundred and eleven, and a decrease of one hundred and thirty-five; loss, twenty-four. Minutes of the Little River Association of 1875: increase, five hundred and thirty-five; decrease, five hundred and thirteen; gain, twenty-one. Minutes of the Little River Association of 1876: increase, three hundred and seventy; decrease, four hundred and forty-one; loss, seventy-one. Minutes of the Big Saline Association of 1873: increase, sixty; decrease, seventy-five; loss, fifteen.

Now, let me ask, what benefit it would be to us to hold protracted meetings, and pretend to convert members, and to

drag them into the pale of our churches, and in a short time to have confusion among us in having to exclude nearly one-third of those we had received by such methods. For my part I would rather be a few, and live in harmony and fellowship, as we Regular Baptists do, than to have to receive such numbers and have all the time confusion among us in excluding them.

---

REV. MR. WALLACE SAID:

GENTLEMEN Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: I am before you this time to commence a work quite different from what I have been doing heretofore. I will, however, before commencing, notice a few things pertaining to the subject that Mr. Hardy has referred to.

In the first place, he has read from Wayland, and he has been caught garbling a quotation from that book, as Coffey did from Benedict. What was Mr. Hardy's object in doing that? I leave it to this congregation. I tell you if I did such a thing as that, and was convicted of it, I would take it back. I say Mr. Hardy has misrepresented Wayland here. He has tried to leave the impression on the minds of this people that Wayland has stated here that some of our people "dress up" Jesus Christ so that we would not be ashamed of him.

Mr. Hardy—I did not state that Mr. Wayland said that. I said that I read from Wayland.

Mr. Wallace—Notice what is said here in Wayland, page

324: "Dr. Wayland's private kindness, and his public labors, his patient watchfulness over the young, and his toils in the pulpit and in the pastoral office, his efforts for the enlargement and liberalization of high education, and for an increase in the numbers and in the efficiency of the ministry, were simply the expression of his desire for the elevation and happiness of humanity."

This is what he says of others; for he is speaking of the Puseyites, Presbyterians, Congregationalists, &c. Why did not you go on with the quotation you made here? Here is what follows: "He still cleaves to his old friends, the publicans and sinners; and if we will not meet him in such company, he turns away from us. I have, of course, no objection to education in the ministry; but I object to giving it a place not authorized by Jesus Christ, and making it a *sine qua non*."

Now, what is a *sine qua non*? It means an indispensable condition. Wayland objected to it, because he says he was in favor of turning a man loose whether he had education or not, and letting every man do as much good as he could. Have not our people always done that? We have not degraded men who have not theological education, but we are in favor of a theological education. Suppose a man with education does as much good as the man without education, is it any reason why the other man should not have education? Suppose brother Hardy could do as much good in one year as I could in two, is that any reason why you should take away mine? Every man feels it his duty to stand before his God, and he uses his information the best he can, whether he has education or not.

Mr. Hardy has raised this question of education and schools

again, when I thought it had been settled. He brings it up, and appeals to me to reiterate what I said before. He does this, thinking it will throw me off from my line of argument; and I would not have referred to this matter again anyhow, had it not been for the fact that there are some persons here to-day that have not heard the answer I have made to these charges before. Now, I ask Mr. Hardy, in the name of decency, to let these things alone.

Now, here he comes with his tract affair, and says that we claim that that is a means of salvation. Now, did not I have the question of means up here before, and did not he come back and say that he had never denied means? But now he turns around and ridicules missions and the circulating of tracts. Don't the people here see that? What is a tract? It is nothing but a short discourse. Now, has not a man a right to publish a discourse in a religious newspaper? Is not that a common and reasonable thing to do? And can there be any objection to its being read? Then why cannot God use tracts in the conversion of sinners as easily as he can use the gospel or the Bible? Sometimes the smallest things will set a man to thinking seriously. I learn that Newton was led to thinking by laying under a tree and seeing an apple fall. I once heard of a woman of the world who, on seeing a girl read a good book, asked the question how and why she spent her time in reading such books, instead of enjoying herself. She happened to cast her eye over the shoulder of the reader, and she saw in large letters the word, Eternity! She retired to bed, and when her companion went up she found her weeping. On being questioned she said she had been thinking of that word eternity, and she said, "O that I were prepared for eternity! When I cast my eye on that

word, it made my heart sink to feel that I was not prepared for eternity." And God used that as a means of leading to the conversion of that woman. Then why does Mr. Hardy ridicule and abuse the use of means, when he said yesterday that he believed in means, and had never denied it? I tell you God is an all-powerful God. He works in many ways and with many means. We cannot confine the power of God. Mr. Hardy has talked a great deal about this, and has made the point, and the only point that he has made; it is a total failure.

"Our minutes," he says, "show an expense of only \$21.50." Now, I recollect seeing a little affair at Still Creek Association, that was published by Thomas Harrison, that cost \$12.50. Why did it not cost more? Because there were only six hundred members in the association, and there were but a few copies needed. And the only reason that it costs their association so little to keep it up is because there are so few of them. Here the Little River Association has the rise of five thousand members, and of course it costs them more for such things. So there is nothing whatever in his point of the relative cost. They have no Sunday Schools, nor do they circulate tracts; all they do is to publish lists of their delegates, and that costs but little.

Mr. Hardy speaks of the fussing among us. Now, considering the quarreling and fussing that have taken place among his people, it is in very bad taste for him to say anything about it. Remember the trouble you had not long ago about this Two-Seedism doctrine, and when you were about to have a fuss about who made the devil, until brother Worlds shut you up about it. Don't you think it is about time to let the subject of fusses drop? For my part, I don't

deny that there are fusses among us. I know that it is a shame that we should have them, but the devil gets a little the best of all of us sometimes.

Now, for the satisfaction of some of the audience, I will quote Mr. Hardy's own author. Watson, page 399: "Paul, however, does not affirm, like some of our modern innovators, that means or instrumentalities are not employed by the Lord in the divine plan of salvation." This, I repeat, is from one of their own authors, and yet Mr. Hardy comes up here making light of tracts being means of converting a woman.

Now, by this statement here you are an innovator; you come under the head of innovators, according to Dr. Watson's testimony; and if you deny his statement, it is one of your own writers that you have to fight. Watson proceeds, "For he asks, 'How shall they hear without a preacher?'—Romans x. 14. Paul, it is true, preached the gospel in word only, while the election of God was manifested in the power and assurance of the Holy Spirit imparted to his words, when received by the elect, which apart from that power and assurance would have been received in word only, as it really was by others not embraced in the divine election."

Now, the same book, page 532: "We have become reprehensibly careless about means, as they are termed. Means, in the hands of God, partake of his power; in ours, of our strength only. We employ means with a prospect of success only in faith, irrespectively of any confidence in them apart from the power of God." And to-day, brethren, I know that if the divine Spirit of God does not accompany us, we may use the language of Martha in regard to her brother that had died, when she said, "Lord, if thou hadst been here, my brother had not died." And I know whenever the word is

spoken, unless the divine Spirit accompanies it, a sinner will never be moved by it. I know that, because the word emphatically says that no man can come to the Son unless God the Father draw him. I know the divine Spirit of God must touch the sinner's heart and draw him to Christ; and consequently when the divine Spirit of God is preached, when the divine Spirit accompanies the word, the sinner's heart will be touched. I have stated before the difference between these people and us, but I will state it again. While we preach salvation by grace and damnation by works, they preach salvation by grace and damnation by the eternal decrees of God; that is to say, a sinner was never given any chance for his life.

"Such things," says Watson, "become special duties performed according to the commandment of the Lord. Hence it was a duty on the part of the leper to bathe in Jordan, for Moses to smite the rock, for the crew to remain in the ship, for John to say, 'Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand,' for the disciples to say, 'Repent, and believe on the Lord Jesus Christ,' and for Paul and Peter to exhort and admonish the brethren. We should always employ means in faith. We should regard the employment of them on our part only as a duty. In this way the use of means is perfectly consistent with our doctrine; and in this manner they were employed by all the Bible worthies."

That is what Dr. Watson says, that they were employed by Bible worthies. And yet here is Mr. Hardy and his people heaping their vituperations on missions and Missionary Baptists, and they do it to-day.

Watson continues: "God has assuredly connected his work of grace in this world with many visible signs, outward du-

ties, commandments, exhortations or means, as you may be pleased to name them. When one says he does not believe in the use of means, it amounts to his saying he does not believe in a performance of christian duties, for we cannot disparage one without the other.

“Suppose Moses had said means are of no use, neither the rod nor the stretching forth of my arm can do good in this extremity; the leper that the waters of Jordan cannot cure leprosy; Paul that it is not necessary for the crew to remain in the ship.”

You remember that Paul said that an angel stood by him and said that not one of the crew would be lost; and Paul tells them, “Except these abide in the ship, ye cannot be saved,” notwithstanding God had told him that he would be saved. It is evident that their safety was to lie in the use of means, and God had given them the means, and consequently, by obeying them, they were saved. And God to-day invites the sinner to come and be saved, and offers him the means; and to-day these Missionaries are sending out the gospel to the world, and whosoever will may come. Paul says to Timothy, when he admonishes that prayer and exhortations should be made for all men, for he says that it is pleasing in the sight of God. And he says, “Who will have all men to be saved.” Now, was this God’s decreed will? If it was, will not all the human family be saved? and does not every man know it is not God’s decreed will that all shall be saved? As we have children, it is our will that they should do right, but at the same time they do not do right; but we do not cast them off forever. God is merciful, for he has sworn it. He has said, “As I live, saith the Lord God, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked.” “Turn ye,

turn ye from your evil ways; for why will ye die?" I say that this is language too plain for any reasonable man to doubt it. But Coffey says, No, the sinners are dead. They are not subjects of gospel address, and we will not address them. God's word does not preach in that way.

One of the questions I asked brother Hardy was, How many Baptists were there in the United States in 1832? and I assert, fearless of contradiction, that he cannot answer that question. In his last speech he said something about there being no obligation upon him to answer these questions. I know if they had been put to me, or any other questions, I would have attempted to answer them, or have contended that they were irrelevant. In 1832 there were three hundred and eighty-five thousand Baptists in the United States. The separation was going on for eight years. In 1840 there were six hundred and forty thousand Baptists in the United States when the separation took place. Belcher, on page 243, gives you the highest number in the world. He says there were sixty-four thousand of them went out. Now, divide six hundred and forty thousand by sixty four thousand, and you find that where one left a church there were nine remained. Now, is not that turning out men with a vim? One man turned out where nine remained! Now, ladies and gentlemen, you see the utter impossibility of these Old Baptists having done what they claim to have done. They do not have the majority to do it even if they had been in the right. I maintain that they cannot show that they turned us out of the church. I asked Mr. Hardy to tell this people how many they had excluded from their church. There is no trouble about answering that question. The next question is, What is his present number? He has explained about our num-

bers, now I want to know how he gets at our numbers; for we ourselves do not number our people. What is the number over here at the Still Creek Association? Four hundred and six. He sent for the minutes of the antimission body, and it shows his number is forty thousand. And I say if you had left our denomination alone, if it were not for the labors of brother Kirkpatrick, as well as brother Green, among our denomination, I expect the number would come down to ten or fifteen in every church; and yet they are heaping their vituperations upon us, and at the same time receiving members from our congregation into their church—as many as they can get.

---

#### ELDER HARDY SAID:

GENTLEMEN Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: I will speak first of the quotation Mr. Wallace accuses me of having garbled, and I will merely remark in reply to his accusation that I began the quotation and read until I came to a full stop. It is true that I did not read to the end of the quotation, but neither did Mr. Wallace, and so far as that is concerned it amounts to nothing.

Mr. Wallace then goes on to explain why it is that the cost of our associations did not amount to as much as his, and he gives as the chief reason that it is because there are so few of us in comparison with his denomination. You will remember that I quoted from the minutes of the Little River Association of the year 1828, just a short time previous to

the division, where the expense of the association to be defrayed was but \$29.82½. He dwells largely on the point of his order being such a large body of people. Where did this large body of people come from? According to his testimony here, it was not from among the Baptists previous to the division, because here in 1828 we see that the Little River Association had only an expense of \$29.82½. Then he goes on to say that we do not preach the full gospel, and he quotes gospel to prove it, "Ye will not come to me, that ye might have life." Let us investigate that. Who spake that language? Jesus himself. And doubtless Jesus was then talking to the dead sinner. Jesus knew they would not do it. But let us not garble the Bible. Jesus says to these characters, "And ye will not come to me, that ye might have life. I receive not honor from men. But I know you, that ye have not the love of God in you." That is the reason they would not come. According to the language, just as long as a sinner is destitute of the love of God he might come to Christ.

Then Mr. Wallace quotes the language of Paul to abide in the ship. Now, was he talking about the eternal salvation, or did he say if they did not abide in the ship that they would be drowned? I understand that there is a common or temporal salvation spoken of in the Bible, and I understand that there is an eternal salvation. I understand that this common or temporal salvation belongs to us, but it takes the power of God to save sinners in eternal salvation.

Coffey, page 122. Mr. Wallace said something about Gano being a missionary from the Philadelphia Baptists. Well, I told you I did not object to the Bible missionaries; I cannot object to the Bible missionaries on the Bible plan; but we understand that this John Gano went to preach, and it is

said that by his labors the churches that composed the Kehukee Association were reformed. These churches previous to the time they were reformed were not General Baptists. But they were reformed by John Gano, Peter Vanhorn, and others. I want to show you what John Gano believed. In his letter to Dr. Watson, Dr. Howell speaks of it, and I will refer you to my former quotation of it.

Benedict, second volume, page 98: "In this situation this cluster of churches continued until more orthodox principles were introduced and a spirit of reformation began to prevail, which finally leavened the whole body, and transformed it into an association of Calvinistic, or as they were then called, Regular Baptists.

Now, these churches, according to the testimony here, were what were called, in that day, "General Baptists," and we learn from Mr. Benedict here that they were reclaimed, and they embraced what was called the "Calvinistic," or what was called the "Regular Baptist" doctrine. "The introduction of Calvinistic sentiments amongst them, which had the happy effect of purifying the churches, took place about the year 1751, and was caused partly by the preaching of Robert Williams, of the Welchneck, in South Carolina, partly by the conversation of a layman, commonly called sley-maker, whose name was William Wallis; but chiefly by the labors of John Gano, who visited them in the summer of 1754."

Kehukee Association, page 262. Now, remember these churches were reformed, and we learn that it was done partly by the conversation of lay members, and partly by Peter Vanhorn, Benjamin Miller, and John Gano. What did they believe after they reformed? They believed the doctrine of the Regular Baptists, and that association is the Regular

Baptist Association of to-day. "In the year 1791, there came from Europe a certain Mr. Frost, in the habit of a Baptist preacher, who at first seemed to be approved of, but soon began to deny the faith of the church, and preach the doctrines of free will, supposing a man had power to work himself into a state of favor with God. This man caused great uneasiness in the church. The brethren appointed a committee to wait upon him and try to gain him over to embrace the principles of the church; but he remained incorrigible.

"The church appointed another committee to go and try to silence him, but could not prevail. He said he had a meeting to attend the Wednesday night following, and he *should* preach. But the Lord interfered in behalf of his distressed church, for when Frost went to preach again, and took his text, which was 'He shall thoroughly purge his floor, and gather his wheat into his garner;' and coming to the words, 'purge his floor,' his tongue failed; he cried, 'Let us pray,' but sunk on his knees, and spoke not another word. He was dead in less than three hours."

You see from this what these people in those days believed. They did not believe in the free will doctrine, supposing that a man could work himself into the favor of God. These people believed emphatically that salvation was by grace.

Kehukee, page 51. I will read the articles of faith adopted by these people, and see if they correspond with the articles of faith that the Baptists believe to-day.

"1. We believe in the being of God, as almighty, eternal, unchangeable, of infinite wisdom, power, justice, holiness, goodness, mercy and truth; and that this God has revealed himself in his word under the characters of Father, Son and Holy Ghost.

"2. We believe that Almighty God has made known his mind and will to the children of men in his word, which word we believe to be of divine authority, and contains all things necessary to be known for the salvation of men and women. The same is comprehended or contained in the books of the Old and New Testaments, as are commonly received.

"3. We believe that God, before the foundation of the world, for a purpose of his own glory, did elect a certain number of men and angels to eternal life; and that this election is particular, eternal, and unconditional on the creature's part.

"4. We believe that when God made man at first he was perfect, holy and upright, able to keep the law, but liable to fall, and that he stood as a federal head or representative of all his natural offspring, and that they were to be made partakers of the benefits of his obedience, or exposed to the misery which sprang from his disobedience.

"5. We believe that Adam fell from this state of moral rectitude, and that he involved himself and all his natural offspring in a state of death; and for that original transgression we all are both filthy and guilty in the sight of an holy God.

"6. We also believe that it is utterly out of the power of men, as fallen creatures, to keep the law of God perfectly, repent of their sins truly, or believe in Christ, except they be drawn by the Holy Spirit.

"7. We believe that in God's own appointed time and way (by means which he has ordained) the elect shall be called, justified, pardoned and sanctified; and that it is impossible

they can utterly refuse the call; but shall be made willing, by divine grace, to receive the offers of mercy.

"8. We believe that justification in the sight of God is only by the imputed righteousness of Jesus Christ, received and applied by faith alone.

"9. We believe in like manner that God's elect shall not only be called and justified, but that they shall be converted, born again, and changed by the effectual working of God's Holy Spirit.

"10. We believe that such as are converted, justified and called by his grace shall persevere in holiness, and never fall finally away.

"11. We believe it to be a duty incumbent on all God's people to walk religiously in good works; not in the old covenant way of seeking life, and the favor of the Lord by it, but only as a *duty* from a principle of love.

"12. We believe Baptism and the Lord's Supper are gospel ordinances, both belonging to the converted, or true believers; and that persons who were sprinkled or dipped whilst in unbelief were not regular baptized according to God's word, and that such ought to be baptized after they are savingly converted into the faith of Christ.

"13. We believe that every church is independent in matters of discipline; and that associations, councils and conferences of several ministers or churches are not to impose on the churches the keeping, holding or maintaining any principle or practice contrary to the church's judgment.

"14. We believe in the resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust, and a general judgment.

"15. We believe the punishment of the wicked is everlasting, and the joys of the righteous are eternal.

"16. We believe that no minister has a right to the administration of the ordinances only such as are regularly called, and come under imposition of hands by the presbytery."

Kehukee, page 49. Now, here is what these Baptists say in regard to their articles of faith: "It was necessary at this time for the churches to present in *their* letters to the association a confession of their faith; because, first, some of them were churches that claimed the prerogative of being the Kehukee Association, that never had departed from their original principles."

If articles of faith were no test of fellowship then, and if every member was at liberty to do as he pleased, I want to know why it was necessary for them to present the articles of faith at that time. Don't you know that when a new church is constituted they have to bring something to show in order to secure admission into our order? And if they do not do it, we do not receive them. It has ever been the practice of the Baptists so to do.

Philadelphia Association, page 69. I want you to notice while I read here: "Upon which fundamental doctrines of christianity, next to the belief of an eternal God, our faith must rest; and we adopt, and would that all the churches belonging to the Baptist Association be well grounded in accordance to our confession of faith and catechism, and cannot allow that any are true members of our churches who deny the said principles, be their conversation outward what it will." Why, if they deny articles of faith, they cannot be members of their church, it says, it makes no difference what their outward conversation may be. It makes no difference that they believe it; they must practice it. It is our duty to

practice what we profess; and it is our duty, if we accept these articles of faith, to do as the Baptists away back there did—not to suffer any to be members of our churches unless they stood up to this rule. They would not allow it away back there, and I say we should not allow it now. Here is their doctrine set forth as the Baptists of those days believed.

I will now read the articles of faith of the Baptists, in their minutes of 1806. Here are the articles of faith that the Baptists held when the Red River Association was organized in 1806. The Little River Association was organized with the same articles, and in the division in 1832 each party took the articles of faith that the Baptists were governed by previous to that time, and they hold them yet—the Missionaries as well as our denomination.

[These articles are already incorporated in a former argument of the speaker.]

Here are the articles of faith of the Missionary Baptists of the Big Saline Association of 1863:

“1. We believe that the Holy Bible is the written word of God, written by men divinely inspired, and is the only sufficient and perfect rule of faith and practice, and that it teaches the following truths:

\* \* \* \* \*

“5. That the election taught in the Scriptures is through sanctification of the Spirit unto obedience and the sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ, and that none are authorized to consider themselves elected until they repent and obey the gospel.

“6. That the Redeemer, by the grace of God, tasted death for every man; that he is the Savior of all men, especially those that believe, and that based on the provisions of the

atonement, all men everywhere are commanded to repent and obey the gospel.

“7. That the influence of the Spirit is coextensive with the proclamation of the gospel.”

---

REV. MR. WALLACE SAID:

GENTLEMEN Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: I am sorry, brethren, that you have been bored as you have for the last half hour. But never mind; I will give you something good now. When Mr. Hardy and myself had the discussion over in Livingston County, before I went there I did not know but what I had quite a contestant to deal with. I supposed we would have quarrels about the grammatical construction of sentences, the meaning of words, &c., and for that reason I took along with me Webster's unabridged dictionary; but I found very soon that I would have no use for that work.

The first thing that Mr. Hardy speaks about is in regard to the “Bible plan” of missions. I would just ask him why he does not show the Missionary Baptists what the Bible plan of missionism is. If he has a Bible plan, why does not he practice it? What kind of a plan is the Bible plan? and why does not he teach that plan to our people? I know the reason for this change. He knows that I will find the existence of missionary operations in the Bible before this discussion closes, and consequently he now turns around and says that he believes in it on the Bible plan. I think if Mr. Hardy

and his people would practice that plan, that they might then be able to do some good.

Next, Mr. Hardy brings up the question of salvation by grace. I have repeated, time and again, that the difference between him and me is that I and my people believe in salvation by grace and damnation by works, while they believe in salvation by grace and damnation by the decrees of God. That is the proposition that we laid down, and Mr. Hardy has not met it. Now, I hope I will not be called upon to discuss this point any further.

I ask Mr. Hardy the question as to the number of his denomination in Europe. I assert that he has not got a single one. There is not an Antimission Baptist anywhere except in the United States. They never did have one there and never will. I know that is saying right smart, and I will qualify it by saying, unless they get out of their old grooves, and go and preach the gospel to some other people besides those in the United States.

Now, brethren, in reference to this missionary matter. The word *missionary* is derived from the Latin word *mito*, which means *one sent*. The word *Apostle* is derived from the Latin word *Apostello*, and means the same thing. Consequently they are synonymous terms. I ask you, then, why it is in every sermon you preach you calumniate and vilify the Missionaries. I see brother Watkins nods his head. Why, don't you preach that, brother Watkins? Why don't you stop your party from heaping their calumniations upon missionary operations?

Then I ask Mr. Hardy to tell who first brought the gospel to America. I answer emphatically that the Missionaries

did; and these people of brother Hardy's to-day owe their existence to missionary work. We are the father of them. Mr. Hardy talked about a man trying to prove himself older than his "mammy." I would like to know whether it is worse than a man trying to prove himself older than his father. I say to brother Hardy that his denomination owes its existence to-day to the missionary labors. If the gospel had not been brought to us by those who believed in missions, we would to-day have been like the heathen nations. I tell you that, instead of being able to meet together as we do and worship the true God, we would have been similar to the other stocks and stones, and nothing would have been heard throughout the land but idolatry. I tell you that, instead of these great institutions of humanity and benevolence that we have among us, we would have been offering up human sacrifices; we would have been bowing down to stocks and stones, and offering up our sacrifices to idols. Yet these people who are abusing missionary operations to-day owe their enlightenment on the gospel to these very operations. I tell you that it is nothing but the gospel that has made us what we are to-day. What is the condition of the heathen nations of the world to-day, that have not had the glorious gospel of the Son of God presented to them? Yet those men who have, out of the purest motives, left their native countries to go into the land of the heathen for the purpose of converting them, are abused and calumniated by Mr. Hardy and his people. And it is not confined to that. As I said before, we have this great organization that prints and distributes Bibles to all who are not able to buy them, so that the gospel may reach every creature. They say that you shall not exhort the

sinner to come to God. Was this the principle of the ancient Baptists? Was it when the people came and asked, "What shall we do to be saved?" They would tell them this is the word of God, to believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, to believe in God.

I asked Mr. Hardy to tell me whether the words "repent" and "believe," as commanded by Christ, were in the active or passive voice. I will answer that question, and say that "repent" and "believe" are in the active voice. Does not the sinner have to exercise repentance and to believe, and does not the minister have to bring them to that repentance? Christ called that his work. But then you say the sinner is dead, and not a subject of gospel address. And it is because of this system of yours that you are dying so fast; and I tell you, you would have been dead long ago if it had not been for the efforts of the Missionaries, and the Methodists, and Presbyterians, in converting sinners, and from whom you receive members and rejoice over them. You do not believe the gospel is a means of salvation. I will hazard the assertion that you may take the gospel away from the people of America, and any smart man can introduce idolatry. There is superstition in every man. You may go around in this part of the country, and you will find horse-shoes tacked over the doors in order, as the occupants say, to keep away witches, and some put them there for good luck. And all this in the face of the fact that we have the gospel, in all its fullness, over this land; we have the revealed word of God to guide us, and yet such superstitions as these exist in this and other States. What, I say, would be the state of things if the gospel were taken entirely away from this country? I

say we would have idolatry in a comparatively short space of time, and no reasonable man of the world will deny this proposition.

The next question I propound to Mr. Hardy, and of which I will now speak, is, Did you ever send a missionary on any plan whatever? If so, from what church and from what association did you send him? and what kind of missionary operations has he engaged in? Mr. Hardy says that he believes in the Bible plan of missionaries, and I suppose his Bible plan is the plan upon which brother Fulkerson was sent to Kansas to organize a church, and had his expenses paid by the brethren here. I presume that is Mr. Hardy's plan, as that is the only case he has mentioned. Is that your Bible plan? Brother Hardy, I think you can get a much better plan than that if you will only try, and I would suggest that you bring your intellect to bear on this subject, if you and your brethren actually believe in a Bible plan of missionaries. Actions speak louder than words. Does not this people know that these Baptists do not believe in missionaries on any plan whatever? If I were to say to you to-day that I believe in a certain thing, and you saw me act to the contrary, what would you think about it? If I were to tell you I could raise as much corn by planting it in October as at another time, and I never planted any in October, would you believe what I said? These people say that they believe in a Bible plan of missionaries. Did they ever attempt any plan whatever? If so, tell me what plan. Why does he not inform this congregation about that plan? We Missionary Baptists would like to hear of it, for it is possible that we may be wrong in our plan, and it is his duty

to enlighten us and put us right. Why does not he do that to-day instead of abusing us, and heaping his vituperations and calumniations upon us? There are people here interested in these things, and I think in the next two days Mr. Hardy can get up a missionary plan and let us hear about it. I am for truth; God knows I do not wish a victory at the expense of truth. I would much rather stay at home, for I expect to answer to God for my deeds; and when eternity is before me, and my spirit must be ushered into the divine presence of God, I shall have to answer for my stewardship here. Then tell us what your plan is. This is certainly not an unreasonable request. Now, perhaps you will tell us in the next two days what is the Bible plan of missionary operations.

The next question I asked him was if he ever had a theological school or seminary, Bible or tract society, or organized prayer meetings, or protracted meetings. Now that I have come to the question of protracted meetings, I will say to the congregation that I have not time to take up history on the present occasion; but when I come to take up history on that point, I will show you protracted meetings that were held years before there was any separation between this people and us. I will show you revivals in the Association of Kehukee, which is now an Antimission body. And what was the result of these glorious revivals? What accessions there were to the church! and what a spirit of religion existed in the body at that time, and before they believed as they do now! I will show you these glorious revivals that these people had in this country while we were united as one church, and I will show you just the same thing in our denomination now. There are some brethren here who know

what is going to come on this subject. And after I prove that, I propose to go back and prove these revivals in ancient times.

Brethren, I will not engage you any more this evening, but hope to have your strict attention to-morrow, and especially when I refer to history and get into the Bible. I thank you, ladies and gentlemen, for the respectful attention you have given me.

The Moderators—Mr. Wallace's time has not yet expired.

Mr. Wallace—All right; I am out of soap for this evening.

[Thereupon, after the benediction being pronounced, the discussion was adjourned until to-morrow morning at 10 o'clock.]

---

### ELDER HARDY SAID:

[Fourth Day—Morning Session.]

[The meeting was called to order, and after prayer by Mr. Spencer, the rules governing the debate were read by Mr. Moderator Perkins.]

GENTLEMEN Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: I am before you again, and if you remember, on yesterday evening, when I closed my last speech, I had just read the articles of faith of the Big Saline Association, dated 1863. I purpose this morning to refer to and make a few remarks concerning them. Now, while I was reading these articles on yesterday, could not this people see a departure from

the primitive condition on the part of the Missionary Baptists? I will again read the sixth article:

"6. That the Redeemer, by the grace of God, tasted death for every man; that he is the Savior of all men, especially those that believe."

Now, I admit that this is Scripture. I refer to it in order to show that it is frequently misapplied. In what sense is he the Savior of all men? Is he the Savior of anybody he does not save? If not, does he save *all* in an eternal sense? Well, if he does not, then eternal salvation is not the salvation under consideration. He is the Savior of all men, but especially of them that believe. Now, please tell me how he can be an equal Savior of all the race of men, and at the same time be a special Savior of a part of the race.

Examine the seventh clause of these articles of faith I have referred to: "That the influence of the Spirit is coextensive with the proclamation of the gospel." Does not the Missionary Baptist Church accuse us of not giving the entire race of men a chance? This is their bugbear. Now, Mr. Wallace, please tell me if the influence of the Spirit is coextensive with the proclamation of the gospel. What do you understand from that? Do you understand that one extends as far as the other? Is that what is meant by the term coextensive? Then you must take the position that the Spirit does not go where the gospel is not preached; and consequently, as there are millions that have not heard the gospel preached, what chance have they to go to heaven?

The fifth clause of these articles speaks in regard to election. I have spoken a good deal in this discussion about this

subject of election. I have set up my position in regard to that matter. I take the position that the election taught in the Bible was personal, eternal, and unconditional. This election taught in the Scriptures is through the sanctification of the Spirit unto obedience. But I understand from the minutes of the Big Saline Association that we are elected when we obey the Son of God; but let me tell you, the Bible does not mean such election as that. I understand election to be a choice, and consequently the Bible says that we are elected before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before him in love; and it says that we are not to consider ourselves elected until we obey. But enough on that point.

Benedict, page 359: "*John Bunyan*, the author of the *Pilgrim's Progress*, I shall place at the head of this list. This name is probably more generally known than any other of the old Baptist authors." Mark what Mr. Benedict says. He states here that John Bunyan was an Old Baptist author. I propose to make a few quotations from Bunyan, and while I do so, bear in mind that Mr. Wallace has said that we could not trace our denomination back of the year 1832. He tries to prove this statement by telling what this woman believed and what that man believed, or what I believe and what some other Baptists believe; but is that what we are going to decide by? I do not propose to prove that the Baptists that came up by regular succession were just such Baptists as some individuals we find in the Regular Baptist denomination of to-day, but I say that the Baptists as a denomination stand on the primitive platform. And let me say again, before I commence reading here, that Mr. Benedict states posi-

tively that John Bunyan is one of the Old Baptist authors. He lived long before there were any Missionary Baptists. He was put in prison for preaching the doctrine I am setting forth here, as we will ascertain presently. He was in prison two hundred and twenty years ago, and we will see now where the Old Baptists came from.

Bunyan's works, page 567: " 'All that the Father giveth me' shall come. In these last words there is closely inserted an answer unto the Father's end in giving of his elect unto Jesus Christ. The Father's end was, that they might come to him and be saved by him, and that, says the Son, shall be done; neither sin nor Satan, neither flesh nor world, neither wisdom nor folly, shall hinder their coming to me. 'They shall come to me, and he that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out.' " Does not that sound like the old Baptist doctrine away back there? Here is a man that was put in prison for disseminating his doctrines over two hundred years ago, just as the Baptists were in the dark ages.

Same book, page 577: "And now, before I go any further, I will more particularly inquire into the nature of an absolute promise:

"1. We call that an absolute promise that is made without any condition, or more fully thus: That is an absolute promise of God or of Christ which maketh over to this or that man any saving spiritual blessing, without a condition to be done on our part for the obtaining thereof. And this we have in hand is such a one. Let the best master of arts show me, if he can, any condition in this text depending upon any qualification in us which is not by the same promise concluded shall be by the Lord Jesus effected in us.

“2. An absolute promise therefore is, as we say, without *if* or *and*; that is, it requireth nothing of us that itself may be accomplished. It saith not, They shall if they will, but, They shall; not, They shall if they use the means, but, They shall. You may say that a will and the use of the means is supposed, though not expressed. But I answer, No, by no means; that is, as a condition of this promise. If they be at all included in the promise, they are included there as the fruit of the absolute promise, not as if it expected the qualification to arise from us. ‘Thy people shall be’ willing ‘in the day of thy power.’—Psalm cx. 3. That is another absolute promise; but doth that promise suppose a willingness in us as a condition of God’s making us willing? They shall be willing if they are willing, or, They shall be willing if they will be willing. This is ridiculous; there is nothing of this supposed. The promise is absolute as to us; all that it engageth for its own accomplishment is the mighty power of Christ and his faithfulness to accomplish.”

Now, who preaches this doctrine that I am reading before you to-day? I don’t think it is worth while for me to make any comment on this passage, because every individual in this congregation knows that that is the doctrine of the Regular Baptists of to-day. Every intelligent man knows that the Regular Baptists are the only people that preach the doctrine set forth here in Bunyan.

Page 580. Here are objections to this system that was put forth then. I will read you what these objections are.

“Objection 6. But how if they have not faith and repentance? How shall they come then?

“Answer. Why, he that saith, ‘They shall come,’ shall he

not make it good? If they shall come, they shall come; and he that hath said they shall come, if faith and repentance be the way to come, as indeed they are, then faith and repentance shall be given to them, for 'shall come' must be fulfilled on them.

"1. Faith shall be given them. 'I will also leave in the midst of thee an afflicted and poor people, and they shall trust in the name of the Lord. There shall be a root of Jesse, and he shall rise to reign over the Gentiles; and in him shall the Gentiles trust.'

"2. They shall have repentance. He is exalted to give repentance: 'They shall come weeping, and seeking the Lord their God.' And again, 'With weeping and supplication will I lead them.'"

Page 584. I want this entire congregation to pay strict attention to what I am now about to read. This Bunyan was a smart man, as everybody knows. "He gave some Apostles, and some prophets, and some evangelists, and some pastors and teachers, for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ, till we all come in the unity of faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ.

"Mark, as in the text, so here he speaketh of *all*—'Until we all come.' We all. All who? Doubtless 'all that the Father giveth to Christ.' This is further insinuated, because he calleth this *all* the body of Christ, the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ, by which he means the universal number given—to wit, the true elect church, which is said to be his body and fullness." Do you want any sounder

doctrine than that? Did you ever hear any sounder doctrine than that I have just read? Did you ever hear anything nearer the doctrine of eternal truth than that? The Baptists stood on the doctrine of eternal truth away back there, and I thank God they stand on it to-day.

Page 599: "The coming to Christ is not by the will, wisdom, or power, of man. This is true, because the word doth positively say it is not.

"1. It denieth it to be the will of man. 'Not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man.' And again, 'It is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth.'"

Now, I will read to you the articles of faith of John Bunyan. He says these are his articles, and this is what he believes :

"I believe that this faith is effectually wrought in none but those which, before the world, were appointed unto glory. 'And as many as were ordained unto eternal life believed, that he might make known the riches of his glory upon the vessels of mercy which he had before prepared unto glory. We give thanks unto God always for you all, making mention always of you in our prayers, remembering without ceasing your work of faith and labor of love, and patience of hope in our Lord Jesus Christ in the sight of God; knowing, brethren beloved, your election of God.' But of the rest he saith, 'Ye believed not, because ye are not of my sheep, as I said,' which latter words relate to the sixteenth verse, which respecteth the election of God. 'Therefore they could not believe, because (Esaias saith again) he hath blinded their eyes and hardened their hearts,

that they should not see with their eyes, nor understand with their heart, and I should heal them.’”

Now, I will read from the same page in article second.

“2. I believe that this doctrine, choice, or election, was before the foundation of the world, and so before the elect themselves had being in themselves; for God who quickeneth the dead, and calleth those things which be not as though they were, stays not for the being of things to determine his eternal purpose by; but having all things present to him, in his wisdom made the choice before the world was.

“3. I believe that the decree of election is so far from making works in us foreseen the ground or cause of the choice that it containeth in the bowels of it not only the persons, but the graces that accompany their salvation. And hence it is said that ‘we are predestined to be conformed to the image of the Son,’ not because we are, but ‘that we should be, holy and without blame before him in love. For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them. He blessed us according as he chose us in Christ.’ And hence it is said again, that the salvation and calling of which we are now made partakers is no other than what was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began, according to his eternal purpose, which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord.

“4. I believe that Christ Jesus is he in whom the elect are always considered, and that without him there is neither election, grace, nor salvation, ‘Having predestinated us to the adoption of children, by Jesus Christ, to himself, according to the good pleasure of his will, to the praise of the glory of his grace, wherein he hath made us accepted in the

Beloved; in whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace. That in the dispensation of the fullness of time he might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven and which are in earth, even in him. Neither is there salvation in any other; for there is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved.'

"5. I believe there is not any impediment attending the elect of God that can hinder their conversion and eternal salvation. 'Moreover, whom he did predestinate, them he also called; and whom he called, them he also justified; and whom he justified, them he also glorified. What shall we say then to these things? If God be for us, who can be against us? Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth; who is him that condemneth? &c. What, then? Israel hath not obtained that which he seeketh for, but the elect hath obtained it, and the rest were blinded.'"

Page 824: "I believe that the Holy Scriptures, of themselves, without the addition of human inventions, are able to make the man of God perfect in all things, and thoroughly to furnish him unto all good works."

I know the Missionary Baptists are getting tired of this book; it is enough to tire them. Will Mr. Wallace come up and say that this is not the identical Baptist that is among our people to-day? Will he say that we as a denomination have departed from the principles that are here set forth over two hundred years ago? I want to say here again that this is the belief of a man who was put in prison for believing in these doctrines two hundred and twenty years ago.

Cramp, page 579. Here the historian speaks of some institutions erected by these Missionary Baptists.

- A. D. 1797. English Baptist Home Missionary Society.
- A. D. 1814. Baptist Irish Society.
- A. D. 1816. Baptist Highland Mission.
- A. D. 1816. Society for Aged or Infirm Baptist Ministers.
- A. D. 1824. Baptist Building Fund—London.
- A. D. 1841. Baptist Tract Society—London.
- A. D. 1845. Southern Baptist Convention (Home Missions and Bible).
- A. D. 1850. American Bible Union.
- A. D. 1853. American Baptist Historical Society.
- In the Foreign Mission Department we have—
- A. D. 1792. Baptist Missionary Society—London.
- A. D. 1814. American Baptist Missionary Union, formerly the “Baptist General Convention.”
- A. D. 1816. General Baptist Missionary Society—London.
- A. D. 1843. American Baptist Free Mission Society.
- A. D. 1845. Southern Baptist Convention (Foreign Missions).

In supporting these institutions we are enabled, by the blessing of God, to expend at least seven hundred and fifty thousand dollars annually, besides sustaining extensive educational operations, and defraying all the expenses connected with public worship and the maintenance of the christian ministry.

REV. MR. WALLACE SAID:

GENTLEMEN Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: I am before you this morning feeling better than ever. That was an unfortunate mistake my brother Hardy made about Bunyan. I will sour him on that. He says, Bunyan is an Old Baptist. Is he? Well, I would like to know what these brother Methodists and Campbellites prove their communion by, if it is not by Bunyan. Why, Bunyan was a Free Will Baptist; and a man who does not know that knows nothing about history. I repeat, his attempt to prove that Bunyan was an Old Baptist was an unfortunate mistake. Our people have had to fight Bunyan all the time on account of his free communion doctrine, as also Robert Hall. Everybody knows they are the fathers of free communion; and yet Mr. Hardy claims Bunyan as an Old Baptist. I should think he would be tired of quoting from Bunyan, a Free Will Baptist.

There are just a few things I want to notice in Mr. Hardy's remarks. The first is as to these articles of faith, that he has been harping upon, about the Spirit being coextensive with the gospel. I suppose, from what he says, that the gospel can go somewhere the Spirit cannot go; I suppose, he will say, then, that the gospel is coextensive with the Spirit. If he will say that the gospel can go where the Spirit of God cannot go, I will take issue with him. I tell you that the Spirit is not dependent alone on the gospel, because God can use every means for his children. But, really, I don't suppose Mr. Hardy knows what coextensive means. I know

that in one sense it means equal, but, in another, it means something else. He says that I said he could not show his denomination beyond the year 1832. Now, I said he could not, as a separate body; and you cannot show it. You were united with us, and never had a separate organization until 1832, except one little church, I believe, in 1825, but in 1832 you commenced, and with the exception of a little prosperity up to 1845, you have been going down ever since, and in twenty-four years you will be dead. You would have been dead long ago if it were not for the converts you make from the Methodists and Presbyterians; you don't give them credit for that.

As to means, the Baptists have never believed in means, he says. First, he made sport of means, and afterwards I made him admit that they believed in means, and again he makes fun of it. Now, brother Hardy, I want to know of you whether you have any article of faith that reads like this: "As God hath appointed the elect unto glory, so he hath by the eternal and most free purpose of his will foreordained all the means thereunto." I will venture to say that he cannot find an article among them that reads that way. That is in the third article of faith of the Philadelphia Baptists. And here is the fifth: "Man having brought himself under the curse of the law by his fall, it pleased the Lord to reveal the covenant of grace, wherein he freely offereth unto sinners life and salvation by Jesus Christ, requiring of them faith."

Now, Mr. Hardy's doctrine is that he does not require anything; that is what they preach, that God does not require anything. Yet here are the articles of faith of the Philadelphia Association, which they say they have not changed.

Now, you may search your denomination through and through, and you cannot find an article like the one I have quoted. But I told you yesterday that a man who says he has never changed, means that he is too perfect to change, or that he is too ignorant. We are all imperfect, and when an honest man sees he is wrong he will change to what he conceives to be right.

I proceed with the quotation from this fifth article: "Requiring of them faith in him that they might be saved; and promising to give unto all those that are ordained unto eternal life his Holy Spirit to make them willing and able to believe." Again, in the seventh clause: "He doth certainly and effectually apply and communicate the same; making intercession for them, uniting them to himself by his Spirit; revealing unto them, in and by the word, the mystery of salvation; persuading them to believe and obey." Yet these people deny that the Spirit of God ever persuades; they deny that on all occasions, and every man before me knows they do. Here it is here that the Spirit of God persuades the sinner to believe and obey. That was the doctrine of these Philadelphia Baptists; an association that was a missionary body, that never had a church in it that knew of antismissionism. There never was a church that split on that in Pennsylvania. And yet Mr. Hardy claims connection with these old Philadelphia Baptists and claims that they have their articles of faith, while here we see they have changed them time and again. I say if Mr. Hardy will show such an article of faith as this in his denomination I will quit right here. He cannot do it. It is like his claim that they had a majority in the Little River Association; they said they

could prove it, but they have not done it, nor will they. They never had a thousand in their association in their lives.

Now, the thirteenth clause of the articles of the Philadelphia Association reads :

“The grace of faith whereby the elect are enabled to believe to the saving of their souls, is the work of the Spirit of Christ in their hearts and is ordinarily wrought by the ministry of the word.”

Now, mark the language, “is ordinarily wrought by the ministry of the word.” The Spirit of God accompanies the gospel, and it is through these means, said these old Baptists, that the elect are led to believe in Jesus Christ. Yet Mr. Hardy and his people say that the gospel has nothing to do with the salvation of the sinner. No, they say, they were saved from the foundation of the world and the gospel has nothing to do with them.

I am now through with articles of faith. Let me refer back to Bunyan. By the way, I am anxious to see that remark of Mr. Hardy’s in print in the report of this debate. He says Bunyan was a smart man. Well, that is true. But any man that knows anything knows that Bunyan was a Free Will Baptist.

Mr. Hardy had something more to say about predestination. I told him I was a pedestinarian. I predestined to raise my flag-pole and throw my flag to the breeze, and to have ‘Victory!’ inscribed on it. Why, Mr. Hardy, I am a better predestinarian than you are. I say God predestined the gospel as a means of salvation. You don’t go that far. I predestined that in this discussion I would give you a good warming. Predestination is to determine before. God did predestine from all eternity to save the believer, and God

predestined to damn the unbeliever, and, consequently, the human family to-day stands under the curse of unbelief. Now, I have done with predestination.

Now, to return to the questions I submitted to brother Hardy on Monday morning, and not one of which he answered, nor attempted to answer, from the fact, as I said before, that some of them he could not answer, and some were diametrically opposed to his doctrine. He never even claimed that they were not pertinent questions; if he had said they were irrelevant to the discussion there might have been some excuse for objection on his part.

Well, yesterday I took up and answered some of these questions myself. I was on protracted meetings yesterday, and I told the brethren that we would see what good old protracted meetings we used to have when we were united in one church.

History of Kehukee Baptist Association, page 137: "A glorious revival took place in the past year according to expectation; and the letters from the churches say that eight hundred and seventy-two were added to the churches by baptism since the last; and blessed be God, the work was going on." Bear in mind this was when we were united.

Page 143: "As early as the year 1778 a revival was greatly desired, and a fast was proclaimed to humble ourselves before the Lord, and to solicit the throne of grace for a revival. In 1785, at Shoulders Hill, another fast was proclaimed. The same year, at an Association at Kehukee, it was agreed to set apart some time between sunset and dark every day, for all the churches to unite together in prayer, and earnestly pray for a revival. And in 1794, the Association agreed to appoint the Saturday before the fourth Sun-

day in every month, a day for *prayer meetings* throughout the churches; whereon all the members of the respective churches were requested to meet at their meeting-houses, or places of worship, and then for each of them, so far as time would admit, to make earnest prayer and supplication to Almighty God for a revival of religion."

Page 145: "The word preached was attended with such a divine power that at some meetings two or three hundred would be in floods of tears, and many crying out loudly, *What shall we do to be saved?*"

Here is what the Baptists did anciently, and that was in the Kehukee Association, which is now an antimission body. We see from this that that same people in those days set apart a particular time for prayer to God for a revival; and God heard these prayers. God has demanded that the church should pray, that they might send forth laborers because the harvest is already ripe—because the harvest of sinners is ripe to-day, and are dying for want of the bread of life. But Mr. Hardy stands up against us, opposing our missionary operations. He cannot forget, though, that when we were united in one church that we had some of the most glorious revivals that were ever known or heard of, but after awhile Mr. Hardy and his people got so cold hearted that they could not stand revivals. I tell you sinners don't like a hot place, and men with little religion cannot stand the good old sisters' shouting, and consequently they went off to themselves, and continued their cold hearted preaching, opposing revivals, and to-day they stand in opposition to it and are fighting us. That was not the case when we were joined together, and when we had revivals. Then God blessed the word spoken and there was no jealousy. We did

not care whose labors were blessed the most, so that sinners were saved. We had harmony then, and in our revivals we could see sometimes two and three hundred people coming up for prayer, and crying out loudly, *What shall we do to be saved?* Did you ever see such a thing as that in an anti-mission church? Did you ever hear of sinners coming up by the hundreds to their meetings and asking to be prayed for, and crying out, *What shall we do to be saved?* That was the case when we were united in harmony, but they went off on this Two-Seedism business, and they failed to warn the sinners and exhort the believers, and so they are fading from existence. I ask pardon of the congregation for getting so warm; this is the warm speaking of a healthy revival meeting. Brother Watkins asked me to come up to his revival meeting, and I will go if he does not back out. But I don't believe he would, for I believe he would enjoy it as much as anybody in the world. But, brother, watch out, you might get flummixed.

Elder Watkins—Don't you fear me.

Mr. Wallace—I mean to watch out for your brethren; they might turn you over if you got too happy.

Kehukee Baptist Association, page 147: "Another thing was observed, *old christians* were so revived they were all on fire." I tell you this is the religion of Jesus Christ—this setting of the soul on fire, "to see their neighbors, their neighbors' children and their own families so much engaged. Their souls seemed melted down in love and their *strength renewed like the eagle's*. Many backsliders who had been runaways for many years, returned weeping home. The ministers seemed all united in love, and no strife nor contention among them, and all appeared to be engaged to carry on

the work, and did not seem to care whose labors were most blessed, so the work went on; and none of them seemed desirous to take the glory of it to themselves, which ought carefully to be observed."

No, sir; so God blessed the people, that was all we wanted, and that is all we want now. We have men among us of the highest and the lowest order, but we care nothing about it, so God blesses their labors.

"God is a jealous God, and will not suffer any of his creatures to take the glory of *his* work to themselves. We hope that no person will ascribe the glory of the work to any person or persons whatever but to the Lord alone. The work increasing, many were converted, and they began to join the churches. In some churches where they had not received a member by baptism for a year or two, would now frequently receive, at almost every conference meeting, several members. Sometimes twelve, fourteen, eighteen, twenty, and twenty-four at several times in one day. Twenty-two and twenty-four were baptized several times at Flat Swamp, Cashie, Parker's meeting house, Fishing Creek, Falls of Tar River, &c. Some of the churches in the revival received nearly two hundred members each. In four churches lying between Roanoke and Meherrin Rivers, in Bertie, Northampton and Hertford Counties, were baptized in two years about six hundred members, and blessed be God, the work seems yet progressing. The work has engaged the attention of all sorts of people, rich, poor, and all ranks. Many very respectable persons in character and office have been called in in this revival. There are a few churches within the bounds of the association that have not as yet experienced a revival, but we hope for them. According to the accounts returned

to the two last associations, fifteen hundred have been added to the churches by baptism in the Kehukee Association."

In one year! Fifteen hundred added to the church! How many have you now, brother Hardy? I have examined your minutes in Still Creek for the past several years; sometimes you have lost, and sometimes gained. Last year you gained twenty-one, I think; but you stand to-day as you did ten years ago, four hundred and six members.

But, brethren, there is so much of this I cannot take time to read it. Here in Benedict I have about a hundred pages in regard to glorious revivals in those days that I cannot touch on. Indeed, brethren, I have as much as two hundred pages of history that pertains to the points in this discussion that I will not have time to touch on. I wish I had, and was sure that you could patiently listen to it, but I cannot do it in five days.

History Kehukee Association, page 202, speaking of Elder Burkitt: "His church seemed very glad to see him return, and soon after a gracious revival took place again in this church. The congregation increased. Evening meetings again were appointed, and more used to attend them than used to attend Sunday meetings before. The word preached was usually attended with a blessing. The hearts of the people seemed opened. A fast was proclaimed by the church, and the Lord heard the prayers of his church. And commonly, when a revival takes place in a church, the people of God are made greatly to desire it previous to its commencement. The youth appeared to be the first imprest with a religious concern. Seldom a meeting after the revival took place but what some offered for membership—four, five, six; and as many as eleven have been baptized at a time. In

about two years as many as one hundred and fifty have been baptized."

I will just read a little more on page 209 of this book: "Sometimes ten, twelve, fifteen, twenty, and *twenty-two* at one time. Thus the work began and increased; and the Lord magnifies the riches of his free grace in carrying on his work by simple means." You know Mr. Hardy denies means. "He is a sovereign agent; he can and does work when and where he pleases, and by strong means, weak means, or no means." That is what the Missionary Baptists preach to-day, weak means, strong means, or no means at all. We do not limit God's power. God can bless people anywhere; and I tell you to-day, if you never had an antissionion preacher among you, you would never have had an antissionion member. Don't you know that your denomination to-day owes its existence to the preachers? And if it was not for them you would have no doctrine. That is how it came up. If your ministers had not led you off from the Regular Baptist Church, you would never have been split off from us.

Well, Mr. Beebe was one of your leading men, and he made the statement that there never was a missionary tract, or missionary society in 1811. Mr. Long was another of the leaders of that order, and Dr. Parker, one of the most notorious Two-Seeders, was their main man, and I will show you that he preached as they preach now, and he made a great many people believe that he was divinely inspired. They do not preach that now, but they go up into their pulpits and they say, "O, my mind is as blank as a piece of paper," and ask God to fill their minds. I believe in an immutable God; I believe in a God that cannot lie, and that when he puts anything into the mind it is the truth. If I did not believe

that I would burn the Bible and quit this discussion. I would not be here to-day defending the principles of christianity; because I believe God divinely inspired the ancients to speak the words of divine truth; and, consequently, there are diversified opinions. Sectarianism arises not from the Bible, but from the errors of a few men. It is not because the Bible is not true, but because we do not understand it alike with our human minds.

---

#### ELDER HARDY SAID:

GENTLEMEN Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: It seems impossible to get my brother to agree with me, for when I quote from his own histories, he will positively deny the truth of the statements of his own brethren. You will remember I quoted from Benedict where he said that Bunyan was an Old Baptist, and that that was the reason that he placed him at the head of the list. Now Mr. Wallace says that he was not. It is for him and Benedict to decide as to that matter; and, so far as I am concerned, I have no other fight to make about it.

So far as these articles of faith are concerned, there has never been an article of faith produced here but what sets forth the doctrine of election and predestination, that God chose his people in Christ before the foundation of the world, and that God saves these people, and nobody else, that he redeemed them, and nobody else. Now I want this congregation to observe a little further. You remember that Mr.

Wallace said that he could prove that I garbled a quotation. If I do not prove before this speech is done that he has been guilty of that, I will agree to admit that I have been worsted in this discussion. He told us yesterday that there were none of the Old Baptists in Europe. I propose to prove to you here to-day that he made that assertion down in Livingston County, and he impressed it on the minds of the people, that there were no Old Baptists in England corresponding to the Regular Baptists here. I say that Mr. Wallace quoted himself, I suppose that he did not notice it, but he quoted a passage on the day before yesterday that proved that there were Baptists of our order in Europe. And I will show you the truth of that statement. I did not sit behind him with my ears stopped.

Hitchcock, page 1117: "In England there are 'Particular Baptists' (Calvinistic), two thousand and twenty-three churches, two hundred and nine thousand seven hundred and seventy-three members."

When he quoted from this paragraph in Hitchcock on yesterday and skipped this important point, he thought I was paying no attention to it probably, but Mr. Wallace has perhaps found out by this time that I have as quick an ear for the garbling of quotations by others as he affects to have himself. Mr. Wallace went so far as to say that if I could prove that there were any of these Baptists in Europe that he would quit this discussion. It seems to me after the vicious attack that he has made on Coffey and Beebe in charging them with garbling ever since this discussion commenced, that he ought to have been more careful in that respect himself.

Mr. Wallace—I say emphatically, Mr. Hardy, that I have not done it.

Mr. Hardy—Well, we will leave that to the people.

Mr. Wallace—Just one moment, if you please. Garbling a quotation is reading and not stopping where there is a comma, or anything of the kind. I do not want to be bothered with anything of that kind. Nor have I since this discussion commenced. Now, brother Hardy has accused me of doing this intentionally. I deny it. When a man begins to read a quotation, he is not expected to read everything in connection with it. I say I have not garbled anything.

Mr. Hardy—Well, now, did not just this same thing arise yesterday in regard to myself? Did not I make a quotation here and commence at the beginning, and having stopped at a proper place, Mr. Wallace got up and made the accusation against me that I had garbled the author. Mr. Wallace has made the statement that there were none of our order in Europe, yet here I show from Hitchcock, at a point where Mr. Wallace could easily have found the contrary to his statement, that there are Particular Baptists (Calvinistic), two thousand and twenty-three churches, two hundred and nine thousand seven hundred and seventy-three members, &c. Is it possible that Mr. Wallace with this book before him, at this identical place, failed to see this, and had he seen it when he declared to this congregation that there was not a Regular Baptist in Europe? Now, for God's sake, Mr. Wallace, let brother Coffey alone.

Next, Mr. Wallace claims that the Philadelphia Baptist Association was a Missionary body. I admit that they afterward went off into Missionism, but I assert that they were

not a missionary body from the first; and Mr. Wallace, nor any other man, can prove that it was. The first missionary society was organized among them, says Mr. Benedict, in 1802; and he tells us they would have sent out a missionary at that time, but that they did not have a suitable man. I have quoted already in regard to this, but I will read again to show what that people believed in 1775, and then I will proceed to show what they afterward got to be.

Minutes Philadelphia Association, page 150: "When all the human race, by the sin of the first man, were involved in guilt, Rom. v. 12, and fallen under condemnation, and all became the children of wrath; it would manifestly be doing them no injustice, if they were, to every individual, left in that state, and eternally punished for their sins; this would have been their proper desert, their just reward. But God out of his mere free grace and love, without any moving cause in the party chosen, hath predestinated some unto life, through a mediator, Eph. i. 4; Rom. xi. 5, 6, (without any wrong done to others), together with all the means subservient to this end, viz., their redemption by the blood of Christ, and renovation by the Spirit of holiness, to the praise of the glorious grace; the other left to act in sin, to their final destruction, to the glory of divine justice, Rom. ix. 22, 23."

On page 428 of the same book we find a passage showing when these people formed their missionary societies. I see that previous to that time there was never any missionary society or Sunday school among them; and I defy Mr. Wallace to find where there was any Sunday school spoken of in these minutes from 1707 to 1807 with the exception of a few. Here in 1802 we find that they formed a missionary society.

It was at that time that they evidently went off into mission-ism. Let me read: "We will mention but one missionary principle more, namely, That the means by which, instrumentally, the great work is to be effected, is the ministration of the divine word.

"We would not be understood as this is supposing that this is the only means. Whenever salvation goeth forth as a lamp that burneth, it will be in answer to the prayers of Zion, and as it extends, private christians will, in their several circles, be instructors: 'Every man shall teach his neighbor and every man his brother until all shall know the Lord.'"

I want to know if these people stand on the Bible ground to-day. I want you to notice the departure that they have made. We see that just previous to this time that they believed in no such thing as is put down here. Mr. Wallace, however, may say that that was merely the notion of one man, but if he will observe he will find that this is contained in a circular letter written by the association in 1806, and they positively declare here, in opposition to the word of God, that "every man shall teach his neighbor and every man his brother until all shall know the Lord." They pretend here to quote the new covenant; they are attempting to impress the people with the belief that they are quoting something from the Bible. The new covenant says that you shall not teach every man his neighbor, but here they declare another thing. God says, "I will make a new covenant with the house of Judah;" not the same covenant, but "a new covenant will I make with the house of Israel." And here is the covenant made with his people, and the Missionary Baptists cannot overturn it. They cannot make it mean

anything else but what it says. Jesus Christ says that you shall not teach every man his neighbor and every man his brother, for the reason, he says, that they all shall know me. What "all" is that? It is the "all" that Bunyan speaks of. It is the church of the living God.

Mr. Wallace has had a great deal to say during this discussion about antimissionism. I say that we have never denied the charge of antimissionism, but I ask him, Where do we get that name? Let Mr. Benedict tell. He says it was given to us by our opponents (see page 935), and that is where many other charges that we are lying under to-day come from—our enemies.

Dr. G. R. Graves, in a communication, which is his own confession, has admitted nearly everything that I have accused these Missionary Baptists of. He has admitted that they gave gone off into error. He has admitted that by these wonderful revivals they have attracted many into the church unregenerated. He says the like was never known among the Baptists before these things came into existence. But what do we see now? We see that he just acknowledges that they have departed one hundred years from the doctrine of Christ our Savior.

I shall now read to you something concerning the General Association of Kentucky Baptists. In the constitution of that association the first article is:

"ARTICLE I. This body shall be called the GENERAL ASSOCIATION OF KENTUCKY BAPTISTS.

"ART. II. The payment of thirty dollars constitutes a life membership."

Now, brethren, if any of us should want a life membership in this association it can be had for the sum of

thirty dollars. There is not an individual here but knows that such a thing as this is a departure from the original principles of the Baptists. There is not a single individual, I will venture to say, within the sound of my voice, but knows that it is so. If we have not thirty dollars, that misfortune can be remedied, it would seem, from what follows, for here is what it says: "Annual members may take seats upon the payment of one dollar. Churches and associations auxiliary to this body, by contributing to its objects annually, are entitled to representation.

"ART. III. It shall be the duty of every member to obtain leave of absence before leaving the Association, and the Secretary shall give no certificate of membership to a member who has not this leave, or who does not remain until the adjournment of the meeting.

"ART. IV. The business of this body shall be to promote State missions; also the Home and Foreign mission work under the Boards of the Southern Baptist Convention; also Bible and Book Colportage, Sunday Schools, and Literary and Theological Seminaries in the State, and to collect and preserve our denominational history of Kentucky.

"ART. V. This body shall exercise no ecclesiastical authority.

"ART. VI. This body shall, on meeting annually, elect by private ballot a Moderator, two Assistant Moderators, and a Secretary and Assistant Secretary, whose duties shall be such as custom imposes upon their respective offices. They shall hold their offices until superseded by successors.

"ART. VII. At each annual meeting the body shall appoint an Executive Board consisting of fifteen members (five of whom shall constitute a quorum) to conduct its business

during the intervals between its annual meetings. They may appoint a Treasurer, a Corresponding Secretary, an Agent or Agents, and Missionaries and Evangelists; shall fix and pay their salaries; and report their doings annually to this body. They shall be competent to fill vacancies in the Board."

Now, just a little in regard to these salaries that were fixed. On page 13 is the following under the head, "The Total Work Performed by the General Association and Auxiliary Bodies. Employed twenty-six missionaries, who preached about three thousand sermons, organized nine churches, fifteen Sabbath Schools, and had one thousand and nine members added to the churches. We raised for the support of these missionaries thirteen thousand six hundred and seventy-one dollars and ninety-two cents."

I want to ask this intelligent congregation (for I stand before you to-day and say as an honest man, before God, I do not want anything but the truth), was any such thing as this ever known among the ancient Baptists? I say we do not believe in such as this, and the old Baptists did not; and consequently we stand on their doctrine. We have not departed from the original landmark upon which the Baptists anciently stood. I have been reading histories concerning these things for several years, and I have never yet seen anything like this, where the admission into an association of Baptists was dependent upon the payment of one dollar cash in hand. I have never seen where a Baptist could become a life member of any association on the payment of the sum of thirty dollars. I want to show these Missionary Baptists their inconsistency here. I want to show them what they are doing, for I am sure they have not considered this thing.

I know very well that the people in these days and times are led altogether too much by their teachers, and do not look and think enough for themselves. Brother Smith up here asserted publicly that the Missionaries had such things among them, and they gave him the lie, and he had to prove it conclusively before they would acknowledge it. Many of these Missionary Baptists are in the dark as to these things; they do not know to-day what is the doctrine of their denomination, but they depend entirely on their preachers. Well, as to this association you can become a life member for thirty dollars. But suppose after having paid that sum of money a member should turn out to be an immoral man or woman, a drunkard, or guilty of any great wickedness, what are they going to do with him? He has certainly paid his money and is a life member of the association; after having been admitted for life can they throw him out?

---

REV. MR. WALLACE SAID:

GENTLEMEN Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: I am before you again on demand. The first thing I must notice, and I am sorry to do it, is this matter of garbling. I have not said anything about it to-day, and I don't think there was any necessity for Mr. Hardy referring to it again. He denies my charge, but the brethren here will remember how I put it under his nose. In the first place, he quotes from Hitchcock's Analysis to show that there were Regular Baptists in Europe. He claims these that are named here as

Regular Baptists, these Calvinistic Baptists. Now, we will see about that.

Ray's History, page 31: "The year 1689 was a distinguished epoch in the history of the English Baptists, on account of the General Assembly, which then convened in London and published a confession of faith, which was long a standard work among them. This assembly was composed of delegates from upward of a hundred [one hundred and seven] congregations, from different parts of England and Wales. They met September 3d, and continued in session nine days; a narrative of their proceedings was published soon after.' One item of business transacted in this body is recorded thus: 'At this convention the denomination, among other things, resolved to raise a fund for missionary purposes, and to assist feeble churches; also for the purpose of ministerial education.'"

Here are Regular Baptists, and Mr. Hardy says that they are the same people, and that he believes as they did. Now, brethren, what have you to say to that? Did these people ever have a theological institution? No, sir. Mr. Hardy has been harping a great deal on this matter of general conventions, and saying that such things were not known among the ancient Baptists. We will see if I can disprove that. What I have just read as taking place was in the year 1689, hundreds of years before these people had any existence.

I turn to Benedict, page 35: "Nothing was more remarkable about the early Waldenses than their missionary spirit; and the same thing is true of all the people of that age and character. It was by sending out missionaries two by two on foot to visit their brethren dispersed in France, in the north of Spain, Flanders, Croatia, Dalmatia and Italy, that

they kept alive the little piety that existed in the world at that day. These missionaries knew where to find their brethren; they went to their houses, held little meetings, administered the ordinances, ordained deacons, and sustained the faith and hopes of the persecuted and tempted ones. It is said that these missionaries would go at periods from Cologne to Florence, and stay every night at the houses of their brethren. It is on account of the great number of missionaries which these little and poor churches in the valleys sustained, that we read of there being sometimes one hundred and forty or fifty ministers at the meetings of their synods."

What is a synod? Why, it is a general convention; and here we see the Waldenses having general conventions long before the Reformation, and long before my brother was born or ever thought of.

"It is also remarkable that almost all the men whom God raised up from time to time in France and other countries, for more than six hundred years before the Reformation, seem to have had more or less to do with the Waldenses, such as Peter Waldo, Peter Buris, Henry of Toulouse, and Lollard, who labored with so much zeal to diffuse the truth in England, and who was burned at Cologne.

"But not only did the preachers go out from the valleys to proclaim the glorious gospel, but humble and pious peddlers, itinerating merchants, of whom there were many in the middle ages, scattered the truth by carrying some leaves of the Word of Life, of some MSS. tracts beneath their merchandise, which they engaged those whom they found favorably disposed to receive and read."

O, these tracts! tracts! is the cry, Mr. Hardy. Never such a thing was known among the Baptists, says Mr.

Beebe, until the year 1811, as a tract. Yet here we find them being used before the Reformation. Not only did ministers go throughout the country itinerating merchandise, but they carried the gospel to the people, and they carried some leaves of the Word of Life, or some manuscript tracts, that they might know something regarding the plan of salvation. I think Mr. Hardy had better have left that point alone.

Then see Ray's History, page 32: "And they raised funds for *missionary* purposes and ministerial education; therefore they were not Antimission Baptists. So these *Old English* and *Welsh Baptists* were 'Missionary' Baptists." Don't you know they never would have raised money for missions and for the education of ministers, if they had been Antimission Baptists? But Mr. Hardy claims they were Regular Baptists, and says that Benedict calls them Old Baptists. I say he never called them Old Baptists. Benedict calls them nothing but Antimission Baptists. Benedict was a Missionary Baptist himself, and he calls us Old Baptists, and he never calls you anything but Antimission Baptists.

I still read from Ray: "But again, all admit that the Old Welsh Baptists were as true to the cause of Christ as any others. Were they Antimission Baptists? No. For several centuries the Welsh Baptists had been prevented by cruel persecutions from meeting together in large bodies or associations, and carrying out their plans of united efforts in the mission work; but as soon as an opportunity was offered, they met again in an associational capacity. Davis, in his history, gives the following account of the association that met at Abergavenny, in 1653, one hundred and seventy-nine years before the Hard-Shell secession: 'In the association

held at Swansea, 1654, the church at Llantrisant proposed to assist the church at Abergavenny, now Llanwenarth, to support their minister; which also they did. From the messengers of Llantrisant, also, the proposal to revive the ancient order of things, came the preceding year; that is to encourage and support the missionary cause. Let our brethren in the New World look and stare at this, especially our antimissionary friends! Be it known unto them that in the year 1653, in the Welsh association held at Abergavenny, County of Monmouth, South Wales, collections were made, when the Welsh church subscribed to raise a fund for missionary purposes. Their plan was, for the messengers of every church to mention a certain sum, and to bind themselves to bring that sum with them to the next association. For instance: Swansea, five pounds; Llantrisant, two pounds ten shillings; Cartmathen, two pounds ten shillings. No one was compelled to give anything; neither was any messenger ever blamed for making such arrangements, but was cheerfully assisted by his brethren to fulfill them.'

"We have not only found that the early American Baptists were missionaries, but the English and Welsh Baptists, from whom they sprang, were missionaries also. The ancient order of things with them *was to encourage and support the missionary cause.*"

Here is what these Welsh Baptists said: "reviving the ancient order of things," which was missionary works—one hundred and seventy-nine years before there was any separation between these people and us on the missionary question. Don't you see how Mr. Hardy has been heaping his abuse on missionary operations and general conventions since this discussion began, without his knowing what he was talking

about? He has asserted that such things were not known among the ancient Baptists time and time again. But why dwell on this longer? If this discussion be printed, everybody will have a chance to see what has been proved, and what has not been proved. You must be tired of history; and, so far as I am concerned, I will try to get out of it to-day.

Mr. Hardy speaks about the Baptists taking the Bible as the only rule and guide, &c. Here you have articles of faith to bind you by. The Missionary Baptists never did that; they take the Bible, and let every association have their own articles of faith. But you have articles of faith and "flummox" your members if they do not come up to them. That is your guide; it is not the Bible, but your articles of faith that you adhere to and rely on.

Brother Hardy, do you practice anything that is not in the Bible? If you say you do not, show me where you have any authority for meeting houses; show me where you have any authority for preaching at funerals. Logic teaches me that if a man breaks one note he ruins the whole harmony; if you break your arm the whole body is affected. My Bible teaches me that if a man violates the law in one particular, he violates the whole. Such things as I have mentioned are not taught in the Bible. Again, where have you any law for licensed preachers and religious newspapers? Where have you any authority in God's word to translate the Bible? Where have you any authority for associations? There is no authority in the Bible for any of these things; and if you practice them, you practice something that is not laid down in the law.

Mr. Hardy—Well, don't you do it, too?

Mr. Wallace—Yes; but I am talking to you now. You claim that you do nothing but what is in the Bible. There is the difference between us. We do not pretend to look to the Bible for authority for everything we do. Have you any authority in the Bible for riding in buggies or riding on cars or steamboats? Why, you are so primitive that it is a great wonder to me that you don't travel as Jesus Christ did into Jerusalem—on the back of a long-eared animal. The Scripture nowhere forbids me to counterfeit money, still nobody claims it is right to do that. The Scripture nowhere forbids me to frequent gambling-houses; but does it follow that there is any justification for doing that? We are not specifically commanded anywhere to punish counterfeiters; but is it not right and proper that they should be punished? And so on. How many thousands and thousands of things might be enumerated of that kind that the Scriptures are not specific upon, but which we know are right or wrong. Where is there anything in God's word teaching you that it is right to sit up with the sick and dying? Is there anything specific for that in God's word? Yet he says it is not right. As I say, there are thousands and thousands of things that might be enumerated here that God's divine truth is not specific on, but which we know are right, and things are commanded that we shall not do that we know is a proper command. It is impossible, indeed, that the word of God could be specific on everything. The first five chapters of the Bible give us a compendium of two thousand years. Can everything be formulated that takes place in such a length of time as that? Certainly not. The Bible is simply an epitome of what is right, and from that epitome deductions are to be drawn, and thousands of things are deduced from it; for, if everything

were specified, as the Apostle said, the world itself would not contain the books. It is nonsense to talk about such things.

My friends, the time is near at hand for me to leave history and go to the Bible. I do not think I will suffer from Mr. Hardy's quotations from history any more. There must be something brought up that I cannot stand before I will trouble myself with his quotations again.

Now, I will sum up. I have made the charge that they preached salvation by grace and damnation by the decree of God. Mr. Hardy has not attempted to disprove that much, and it stands now against him as proved. I have shown you the position of these people on Bible societies and the work of missionaries and in the support of orphans. He has never attempted to answer any of these things. They are undertaking to-day to prescribe a man's conscience. If one of them should give a dollar for any of those benevolent purposes he would be turned out of the church.

I will relate an anecdote about an old gentleman, who had two sons. It appears that the old gentleman took too much toddy and they turned him out of the church on account of it. Well, the young man having the terrible example of his father before him went and joined the temperance society, and they took him up and turned him out of the church for that. The other son of the old gentleman, having thought over the matter, went to the church and said, "You have put my father out of church for drinking too much, and you have put my brother out for not drinking at all. Now, I would just like to know how much I must drink to remain in fellowship."

## ELDER HARDY SAID:

[Afternoon Session—Prayer by Elder Perkins.]

GENTLEMEN Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: I am again before you to pursue my argument in my own way. My brother has come up with his arguments to try to prove that the Baptists away back there did something that they (the Missionaries) are now doing. Mr. Wallace intimated that he could not see how a man could be illiterate and yet be a smart man. Bunyan was not a learned man; but I understand that there are a great many men in the world that are smart and sensible men who have no education at all, so far as that is concerned. A great many of the Baptists anciently were illiterate and unlearned men. There were some of the Apostles, according to the Bible, that were unlearned men; but that fact did not prevent them from knowing Jesus. I do not understand from the Bible that we can be taught Jesus by schools, that we can be taught Jesus by theological schools or any other kind of schools. I understand, in the first place, that we have to be taught by the Spirit of God. The Bible informs me that "the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him. Neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." And if a man is educated, that does not enable him to explain the Spirit of eternal truth while he is destitute of the Spirit of God. He may understand about it, but as far as the spirituality is concerned, the Bible says he cannot understand it. Let me read to you as

to that. Acts iv. 13: "Now when they saw the boldness of Peter and John, and perceived that they were unlearned and ignorant men, they marveled; and they took knowledge of them, that they had been with Jesus." We see here that it is stated distinctly that the people took knowledge that these men were ignorant and unlearned simply from the fact that they had been with Jesus, and that they had been taught the truth as it was in Jesus. Notwithstanding that they were considered ignorant and illiterate men as far as worldly wisdom was concerned, they could preach and understand the wisdom of the Son of God in all its purity. Does not the Bible say that "not many wise and not many noble are called, but God has chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise, and God has chosen the weak things of the world to confound the things which are mighty, and to bring to naught things that are?" It makes no difference how ignorant the Old Baptists may be, it is only showing that we stand where the Waldenses and the ancient Baptists stood. I admit that the Regular Baptists as a general thing are uneducated people; but, while I admit this, I believe that we have men among us that are as learned as any people anywhere. We have men among us that are educated and that could translate the Bible if they wanted to; but we do not want any translation of the Bible. This Bible is good enough for us; and when we hear people talking about this Bible being wrong, and saying to people that we need a new translation, just let me know what they need. It is not the Bible, but the people that need translating from darkness into light by the power and influence of God; and if they were translated they would understand better the Bible that we have.

Mr. Wallace has brought out a lot more of questions for me. He wanted to know, for instance, whether the Bible authorized us to build meeting houses. He wanted to know whether the Bible warned us against gambling houses and counterfeiting money. He wanted to know whether the Bible authorized associations. These have nothing at all to do with religious matters. Let me tell you where he got this. I could have read these questions myself as well as he. Here is the *Baptist Banner*, and in this newspaper there is a long rigmarole of questions, just as Mr. Wallace has got them off here. What was he doing then? He was trying to prove that he and his people were Old Baptists. He tries to prove that they are Old Baptists; and when he quoted this paper, I thought if I was a Missionary, and believed their doctrines, that after reading this I would turn over and be an Old Baptist, because if they could have done better than this they would have done it. It is the poorest argument that I ever heard of. It is enough to convince anybody that they are wrong.

Mr. Wallace has repeated the statement that we Old Baptists turn out our members for giving their money to support benevolent institutions. I know that Old Baptists have given their money for these things, and given it with pleasure, and there is not an Old Baptist here to-day that ever heard of a member being turned out of church for doing it. He referred to Benedict before to show that we turned members out of church for joining secret organizations. We do do that, and more than that, the Bible authorizes us to do it. If the church of Christ is not enough, I don't know what is. We believe that when we join the church, that is above every-

thing. We believe that the church of Christ is enough; and I tell you, if the people of God would leave everything else but his word, and stick to it, they would be nearer the truth than they are, and there would be no necessity for secret organizations of any kind.

Then there has been a great deal said about the Baptists being whiskey drinkers. They have been accused of being "whiskey Baptists" all their lives. I understand from the Bible that the disciples on a certain occasion were accused of being drunk. You will remember that on the day of Pentecost, when Peter preached, he was accused of being drunk with wine. Peter said, We are not so drunk as you are; and I might say to-day with equal propriety and force, that the Old Baptists do not get as drunk now as those people who give us this name. But why speak of it? It is a burlesque on the name of Old Baptists; they have had to suffer an accusation of this kind, just as the Apostles did. So far as I am personally concerned, I have this to say, that in the portion of Kentucky where I live there are certainly no drunkards among the Baptists. If there are any, I certainly don't know it. I know, too, if the Baptists in any part of the country practice whiskey drinking, they are doing wrong, and ought not to be allowed to remain in the church. My brother Wallace's anecdote about the old man who was put out of the church for drinking too much, and his son meeting the same fate for not drinking at all, doubtless has a point to it; but if that point is that members are put out of our church for not drinking anything, it has been altogether lost. For the information of some of my brethren, I will say that I don't drink whiskey at all, and that that is a fact well known; and yet I am in the church, and am here indorsed in

this discussion as the mouthpiece of the Regular Baptist denomination.

Then Mr. Wallace comes on again with his little tracts, asserting that they are a great means in the salvation of sinners. Well, if that is so—if Sunday schools and tracts, as has been said, are the greatest ordained means in the salvation of sinners, tell me how sinners were saved before these means were known. So far as I can find there is but one plan of salvation mentioned in the Bible, and that plan is certainly not tracts and Sunday schools. Mr. Wallace made a quotation from Ray on this point. Now, Mr. Ray, in what he said, may be telling the truth and he may not be. He has told some things that were not true, and I have proved it; but I want to know if these people away back in those days had organizations such as Mr. Wallace speaks of and supported such missions as he mentions, whether the organizations and the supporting of them were fixed up for that purpose. This people know that I have shown where the first missionary society was organized among the Baptists, and it is not worth while to make any further quotations on that subject. However, before I get through here I intend to show where the first Sunday school was organized, and I will show you the Baptists never had a Sunday school previous to that time. I will show you what they did and what they proposed to do. These missionaries now-a-days pretend to use these Sunday schools as a means of the salvation of sinners, and they tell us that God will save sinners if the sinners will only let him. I say that this is not God's plan. Mr. Wallace has told this people a great deal about what our doctrine is during this discussion. He has told some things that we do believe, but he has told other things

that we certainly do not believe. I hear the Missionary Baptists preach nearly as often as he hears the Old Baptists preach. I cannot hear them very often, for nearly every Sunday I have an appointment to preach myself. I used, however, to hear them frequently, and I know something about what they preach. I know of their "protracted meetings" and their "mourners' benches." The Missionaries down in my country had a protracted meeting and a great many mourners. According to their way of preaching a man may come up to the mourners' bench at one meeting, but before another comes around he may be in hell. Now, I am more generous than these people are, and say that every man that has mourned on account of sin will be saved in salvation. I take the position that every man and woman that has mourned on account of their sins will be saved. And why? Because the Bible teaches it. I understand the cause of a man's mourning because of his sins is the work of God, and we are told in the Bible that where God begins a good work, he will perform it. But the Bible does not teach us that it is the man himself that commences the good work. It is God that commences the work, and every work he does is good, because God is perfect. My brother Wallace seems to think they do not preach the conditional plan of salvation. If they do not preach the conditional plan of salvation, I have greatly misunderstood them; for don't they tell the people sometimes that they have a work to do, and they must perform it in order to their eternal salvation? I know that they get down and pray and call on the Lord, and they will tell the sinner that he is helpless and there is nothing that he can do; that he is dependent on the Lord Jesus Christ, but before they get through they tell him there is a

work for him to do in order to his salvation. I understand this to be conditional. All of you people here know that these Missionary Baptists preach in that way. Let me tell you a little anecdote. I think I ought to have the privilege of telling it, as I have not told one since this discussion began, leaving that field entirely open to my brother. I heard a Missionary Baptist once preach, and he told the congregation, in the first place, that the sinner was dead, that the sinner was helpless, that the sinner was entirely without strength; but before he got through he found a work for the sinner to do, and told him to go and do it—that he must do it; that his salvation depended upon it. Well, there was an Indian present that heard the preacher's remark, and he saw the inconsistency in the system, and after the preaching was over the speaker asked him how he liked the sermon. "Well," says he, "I will answer your question by telling of an incident that I heard once. I heard once of a boat floating down the river with three persons in it, and one of these persons was totally blind, the second had no arms, and the third was naked. Well, the man that was blind said, I see a gold watch in the bottom of the river, and the one without arms reached down and picked up the watch and gave it to the one that was naked, and he put it into his pocket." It seems to me that such an occurrence as that was entirely impossible. And so what I understand by a conditional plan of salvation is that something has to be performed on our part; and if we have anything to do for our own salvation, that must be performed, or else there can be no salvation, and in that case our salvation would depend entirely upon our own acts.

I take the position that salvation is entirely unconditional;

that there is nothing whatever to be performed on the part of the sinner in his eternal salvation. Then, says one, you believe it is by grace alone. I answer, Yes; that is what I believe; and, as I remarked before, I believe that everything that is necessary to the eternal salvation of the sinner is the gift of God. I believe my brother Wallace admitted here yesterday that faith and repentance are the gift of God, and then in the same speech he said that he exhorted the sinner to exercise repentance. Now, I want to know if a man can exercise a thing that he has not got. Suppose old brother Fulkerson should come to my house, and that while there dinner time was to come on, and I was to go to him and say, "Brother Fulkerson, eat dinner with me." Suppose he should say, "You have got no dinner, brother Hardy," and I should say, "Well, it makes no difference, eat dinner with me anyhow." Brother Fulkerson would naturally reply, "I can't eat dinner, since I have no dinner." Would not that be the most nonsensical of all things, and is it not the same to tell a man to do a thing that he cannot possibly do? Is it not equally nonsensical to tell a sinner to exercise faith and repentance, when faith and repentance are the gifts of God—gifts that he has not received? But Mr. Wallace professes to teach Bible repentance. Now, I tell this people Jesus is an exalted Prince; and when he gives repentance, the sinner will repent. That is what I believe, and that is our doctrine. I know our doctrine is frequently misrepresented. I learned from one of the brethren that there was a paper called the *Baptist Watchman* sent down here in Ballard County, and a lady, who was then a Missionary Baptist, got hold of it, and found where it set forth the doctrine of the Regular Baptists. No doubt she had never

heard their doctrine preached, and she commenced reading the doctrine that we believed, and spoke of it, and people that were then believers in that doctrine became convinced from her conversation that they were in the wrong position, and they came out and joined the Regular Baptists. They were members of a Missionary Church, and I think brother Browder baptized eighteen or nineteen at that time.

Mr. Wallace has compared tracts and such papers with religious papers. There is no comparison. If a man wants to publish a paper it is his own business and nobody else's. The Regular Baptists have no objection to that, but they do not have, in order to keep themselves up, to organize missionary and tract societies, Bible societies, and so on. I quoted from Mr. Cramp and showed you when these things began, that nearly all of them have commenced since the year 1800. I will right here read a little from a circular contained in the minutes of the Big Saline Association of 1867.

*"An Address to the Church of Big Saline Association—Dear Brethren:—*I have long been convinced of the fact that we as an association, and the churches, are not doing as much for the cause of God, and the extension of the gospel of Christ, as we *might* do—not as much as we *can* do. There are small differences of opinion among us, (though we agree in the main,) relative to the mode of procedure, or plan of operations. It is not, if I understand it, whether we *will* do, but *how* we will best labor in the cause of our Master in our bounds. Brethren, while disagreed, and disputing as to the *right* way that we *should* work, we are standing still, and souls are perishing all around us."

I will now read a little here from what is called the Baptist Teacher that was put out by the Missionary Society in

1880. It states here that they may have the Holy Spirit come to them by just asking for it. If their having the Holy Spirit depended upon their asking for it, tell me if there is any condition there. It seems to me so. If they get the Holy Spirit by asking for it, the reception of it is clearly conditional. How such a system as this can be set up and at the same time be claimed to be unconditional, I cannot see.

But it seems to me that I have proved beyond doubt the contradictions here, and that the Baptists have believed in an unconditional plan from the very beginning of the setting up of the church of the Lord Jesus Christ. The Apostles were sent to preach the gospel of the Son of God. I believe that they were sent on a mission, but not through the instrumentality of any missionary board or anything of that kind. They were sent, but they were sent by Jesus Christ, and I tell you that Jesus Christ calls and sends out preachers to-day. My impression is that when Jesus Christ calls a man he needs must go, and I don't believe there is money enough in the world to bribe one of God's preachers not to preach.

[The Moderators here announced that the speaker's time had expired.]

REV. MR. WALLACE SAID:

GENTLEMEN Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen; I am still mending. I am sorry to have had so much cold hash, but I cannot help it; I will try to warm it up for you. I wish to speak of one statement Mr. Hardy made in his speech before dinner. I would not do it, if it were not for the request of my brethren. I refer to Mr. Hardy's remarks about general associations, his statement that he never had any. Now, I have shown, I think, to the satisfaction of every intelligent man here, that such associations were in existence among the Baptists years ago, and really I don't think there is any use of going into it again. But I will notice one thing. He lays great emphasis on the matter of a life membership being had for thirty dollars, or one dollar a year. Now, does Mr. Hardy know that that general association is a missionary body among Baptists? I don't believe he knows anything about missionary bodies. His prejudices are such that they will not suffer him to investigate them. Tell me how any organized body can do anything without means. Why, Mr. Hardy, you cannot print the minutes of your association without means. Now, an association can join the general association if she wants to, and she need not come in at all if she does not want to, and if she wants to she can come five hundred times if she pleases, and if she pays one dollar she can remain or leave as she sees fit. It is just like a church; it is an independent body. She is not obliged to join the association; she is at liberty to do as she pleases in that respect.

Well, then, my brother says that his people are the primitive Baptists because they are unlearned. He says the Apostles were unlearned. Where did you learn that, brother Hardy? Certainly not in the Bible. He professes to believe it, because Peter and John on one occasion were called unlearned. Who called them unlearned? Were they unlearned? Did the Apostles have no education? We find them writing epistles in the Greek language, and anybody who knows anything knows that Peter and John were not Greeks, and that that was not their mother tongue. Were Peter and John ignorant when they had scholarship enough to write epistles in the Greek language? Why, we learn that they had been under theological teachers for years. Christ called his disciples around him and instructed them for three years before he sent them to the ministry, and he was the best theological teacher that ever visited us, and I assure you, too, he was not an Antimission Baptist, for if he had been he would not have left and gone into foreign lands. There would have been no use of his going down and preaching to the heathen.

Means! means! means! At one moment Mr. Hardy believes in means, and in the next, he does not believe in means. He heard a man preach once, and it reminded him of something about one man without eyes, another without arms, and another naked, and there was a watch that went the rounds. Here is a sinner that cannot repent, and yet he says a sinner does repent. This is logic for you. He says the sinners cannot do anything, and yet he says the sinner does something. But such things are not worth taking up time with.

I want to get to the Bible. Mr. Hardy says I love Watson better than the Bible. Aye, Mr. Hardy, Watson was slaying

you, calling you innovators, because you did not preach repentance. Then Mr. Hardy said he preached to all the people; and again he disclaimed it, and says it is no use to preach to the sinner because he is dead, and he is not a subject of gospel address. And, let me tell you, that is the doctrine of his people preached throughout this land and country, that damnation is by the decree of God. If this is not true, he has had plenty of opportunities to deny it, for I made that charge last Monday. I tried to get him to tell me the difference between the expressions, God sends his rain on the just and the unjust, and that Christ died for the just and the unjust. Every man knows that when it is said God sends his rain on the just and the unjust, it means that he sends it on the whole human race. If it is not so, let Mr. Hardy explain it to this people. Why does not Mr. Hardy come up and show the difference? Now, so far as the people among the ancient Baptists being unconditional believers is concerned, Benedict says he could find out from history which preponderated, but he says, at the same time, there was no such strife about it as to cause a division. The first man that ever raised this question was Augustine, a Romish priest. It was out of the Romish Church that this question first came, and I will prove that statement if it is called in question. I say it was never known among the Baptists until this Romish priest raised it, and so far as your vituperations are concerned, it is a Romish monk that you revive to-day. I do not want to have anything more to say about history; but if this statement is called in question, I will prove it, as I have said. Benedict says when the people's hearts are warmed with the love of God they do not continually dwell on these things, but they look for the salvation

of the sinner, and that is the duty of every man who is a true minister of the gospel. And election is God's work. Let him attend to his own work. Election is the chosen work of God; he made choice of every believer from eternity in his own divine mind; his foreknowledge comprehended the end from the beginning. Consequently he can look down the vista of time and see these things. And while Paul was dwelling on these things, he knew the Scriptures foreordained that God would justify unto salvation by faith, which was preached before the gospel to Abraham, saying, In thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed. He was not an Antimission Baptist, because he preached the doctrine of the Missionary Baptists. And Mr. Hardy speaks of the present translation of the Bible; he asserts that this translation is good enough for him. If this translation is true, why don't you sprinkle or pour, for every man knows baptism means to sprinkle or pour? I see some of their brethren winking as if they thought they could turn me down on that. I will bring down the dictionary then and we will see what Webster says, for he is the acknowledged authority on the English language. The word in the original does not mean that; and for that reason the Baptists of old protested against this translation, and if Mr. Hardy and his people were the old Baptists they would protest against it to-day.

Now, as regards the first worshipers. I remarked this morning that the first five chapters of the Bible give us a chronology including about two thousand years. Any man that can read at all can read these five chapters in twenty-five minutes. Of course it was impossible for everything that was spoken by Jehovah to the federal head to have been expressed here. It is, and only was intended to be, a com-

pendium. It tells something of the fall of man from the state in which God placed him. It tells something of man being driven out of the garden of Eden for his transgressions. A man was not placed under the law of necessity, as my brother Hardy teaches time and time again in his unconditional theory. If they had been placed under the law of necessity, they could not have helped doing anything except what they did do, and, consequently, would not have been responsible for it. I will give my brother a little logic on that point. We learn from the Bible that the wicked must be punished. God is the punisher. If God is the punisher, the punishment must be just, because God is just. If the punishment is just, man is guilty; and if man is guilty, he could have acted otherwise; and if he could have acted otherwise, he sinned of his own free will. If anybody can refute that, I promise to quit right here.

For disobedience man was thrown out of the garden of Eden, and it was said that cherubim were placed at the east of the garden, to prevent him from partaking of the tree of life forever. That is what they say, but where does it say that? Let us notice what it does say. "And the Lord God said, Behold, the man has become as one of us, to know good and evil: and now, lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live forever: therefore the Lord God sent him forth from the garden of Eden, to till the ground from whence he was taken. So he drove out the man: and he placed at the east of the garden of Eden cherubims, and a flaming sword which turned every way, to keep the way of the tree of life."

What is the way? The word "way" here is used in a nominal sense. Here now is the type of Jesus Christ. What

does the antitype say? "I am the way." That is the very language. Here were angels placed there, which were the cherubims of the Lord, and the flaming sword here means God cutting in every direction. Here were the angels placed to keep the devil from blocking up the way, and the angels have ever rejoiced in the grand scheme of redemption; the angels never were used to keep away salvation. They are ministering spirits to assist man, in order that he might become a subject of eternal glory. Now, while this is true, we find in the Scriptures that there are conditions. Revelation ii. 7: "To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the tree of life, which is in the midst of the paradise of God," and man is to have sweet communion with the Savior in heaven. And we find when the first worshipers came that they offered their sacrifices; and consequently there can be no doubt that there was given to them a ceremonial law, although it is not given in the Bible. We learn that Cain and Abel offered a sacrifice. If there never had been any commandment of God respecting this, how would Abel or his children have known anything about it? We find how Abel came with his offering, and it was accepted; but when Cain came with his offering of vegetables and fruits, God refused his sacrifice, and Cain was wroth, and we are told he purposed murdering his brother. And God said, Why is it? Said the Lord unto him, "If thou doest well, shalt thou not be accepted? and if thou doest not well, sin lieth at the door." This is the teaching of God's divine word; and I tell you now, that nothing will ever damn a sinner but unbelief. I tell you God never made the sinner a liar; God never made him a robber. Man makes himself these things. God made man good; but he said that if he violated the divine law he is threatened that

he will damn him forever. Man was made a rational creature, and God promised that if he did well, it would be well with him; but if he did ill, sin lieth at the door. It was not meant to terrify the sinner, but every promise of God must be fulfilled. I tell you, my friends, you are all accountable beings before God; and, I repeat, unless you repent of your sins you can never go to heaven. God's divine word to all men is to believe in the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved. Then how can brother Hardy and his people tell the sinner that he must do nothing, that God will save him in his own appointed time, and if his decree has gone forth against him, his flaming sword will cut him down? Tell me, can a man be saved without repentance?

Mr. Hardy has said that I was afraid of the Bible, but I will show him whether I am afraid of it or not. I will give you more of the Bible than he ever had in his head, if you will only listen.

"My Spirit shall not always strive with man." This, says Mr. Hardy, is Noah's spirit; that is the doctrine of these people. Does not any man know that when the Bible's divine truth says, "My Spirit shall not always strive with man," that it implies that there is a time when he will not strive? If I were to say that Smith is a truthful man, I would have an idea; but if every other man in the world was a truthful man, my language would be without meaning. When I say that Smith is a truthful man, I imply that there are other men who are not truthful; and any man who understands anything of logic will comprehend that.

Here is Moses addressing those who had followed him (Deut. iv. 25), "When thou shalt beget children, and children's children, and ye shall have remained long in the land, and

shall corrupt yourselves, and made a graven image, or the likeness of anything, and shall do evil in the sight of the Lord thy God, to provoke him to anger; I call heaven and earth to witness against you this day, that ye shall soon utterly perish from off the land whereunto ye go over Jordan to possess it; ye shall not prolong your days upon it, but shall utterly be destroyed. And the Lord shall scatter you among the nations, and ye shall be left few in number among the heathen, whither the Lord shall lead you. And there ye shall serve gods, the works of men's hands, wood and stone, which neither see, nor hear, nor eat, nor smell. But if from thence thou shalt seek the Lord thy God, thou shalt find him, if thou seek him with all thy heart, and with all thy soul." Mr. Hardy says that the sinner cannot seek God, that he is dead, when God says distinctly that if the sinner will seek him with all his heart he shall be saved. Mr. Hardy preaches that when God's time comes, he will come to the sinner, without the sinner seeking him. I object to that doctrine. So far as the unconditional part of Mr. Hardy's doctrine is concerned, I believe in certain unconditional matters as well as anybody. I will show the unconditional part that I believe in. I don't believe that man had anything to do in the making of the world. Man had nothing to do in bringing himself here. I don't believe man had anything to do in invoking atonement for himself; and so far as the atonement being made, that was unconditional; I am not here to take issue on that. But suppose there are two men in jail, both doomed to die for the crime of murder. Suppose they are lying there helpless, unable to get out by their own power. Suppose that they had both denied upon their trial that they were guilty of the crime charged. Then

the Governor of the State, of his own grace, says to them, "If you will confess your crime I will release both of you." "Well," says one of the murderers, "I will do it, for I am guilty; I know I am a murderer." He is released. What releases that prisoner? Was it not grace? Of course it was the grace of the only man that had the power to pardon him. Grace is a favor, and the grace of God is but the favor of God. And this act of grace of the Governor's, of course was unconditional so far as the prisoner invoking it was concerned. The Governor merely said that if he would acknowledge his guilt he would be released. Then take the other prisoner: he says, "I cannot admit my guilt, because I am not guilty;" and the doors are locked upon him. Does the Governor lock the door upon that murderer, or does he lock it upon himself? The same grace has been offered to both, both being equally guilty. The one accepts and the other refuses it, and denies that he has been guilty of the crime charged. The one accepts the grace, and is released; the other refuses it, and is left to die. God does not shut the door on the sinner; the sinner shuts it on himself.

The Moderator tells me that my time has expired, but I will speak more on that point after awhile.

### ELDER HARDY SAID:

GENTLEMEN Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: Mr. Wallace has concluded his speech, and it is for you to decide whether he has touched on the subject involved in this discussion or not. I don't think he has, but I will notice a few things he has stated. He says, for instance, that God will attend to his own work. That is what I have been telling this people for a long time, and that is what I want this people to understand now—God will attend to his own work. What is God's work? It seems very strange to me that we cannot draw a line of distinction between what God has commanded us to do and what he says he will do himself. Must we not be governed by the Bible in regard to these things? So far as producing much more history on the subject under discussion here, I have to say that I care nothing about it. It seems to me very clear that I have proved everything that it is necessary for me to prove; however, I intend to prove a little more before I am done here. The question arises, What is God's work? Mr. Wallace quotes to show that it is the work of God that we believe on him. Well, if it is the work of God, it is not the work of the sinner that we should believe. The Bible says that it is the work of God that we believe on him; that is exactly my doctrine.

Mr. Wallace undertook to show that the angels were sent to guard the sinner. I suppose he thought it would not suit his system to make the whole quotation. "The angel that

was sent forth,"—What for? Why the Bible says, "To minister to them who should be heirs of salvation."

Then Mr. Wallace comes in on the spirit question, and brother Worlds, or some other Old Baptist, says that this Spirit brought to view here did not mean the Spirit of God, but that it was the spirit of Moses. It says, "My Spirit shall not always strive with man." Now, let us see if Mr. Wallace's system agrees with the language of the Bible. Did not he tell the people that the Spirit of God shall not always strive with man, and after awhile it takes its flight? But this is the text he quotes. It says that "My Spirit shall not always strive with man." Why? Because he is also flesh, and his days shall be one hundred and twenty years, and when his days are out he dies. And the reason that the Spirit will not strive always is because the man won't live always. I don't think my brother has made much on the spirit question.

I propose to notice the Sunday School institution this evening. This people know there are Sunday Schools all over this country, and some persons would have you believe that the Bible is taught in these schools. Further than that, they would have you believe that that institution has been in existence among the Baptists from the days of the Apostles up to the present time. I think I have shown the origin of many institutions that are kept up by people in this portion of the country to-day. I have shown you the date of the organization of the first missionary system as well as many other institutions, and now I will call your attention to this institution of Sunday Schools. I wish to show you the organization of the first Sunday School, and show you what that institution is being used for in the present age, what

the intention is in holding up the Sunday School, in practicing such a thing in the churches.

Belcher (page 998) speaks of the first Sunday School that ever was organized that we have any account of. He tells us that it was organized by Robert Raikes, in the year 1781. It is scarcely necessary for me to read this long account of it. I will merely say that it shows that Robert Raikes in the year 1781 was led to organize a Sunday School in his native city, Gloucester, England, by observing a large number of children wandering through the streets, whose parents, it would seem, were too poor to send them to school. It would appear that Raikes sympathized with these children, and that he hired a room and teachers, to the latter of which he paid twenty-four cents a day for teaching these children. I have no objection in the world to children being taught to read and to write, and so on, and it is a very laudable object in any man to teach children in such circumstances, or to have them taught; but that is not the Sunday School of the present day. They have brought such institutions within the pales of the church, and have used it for the pretended salvation of the sinner.

Mr. Wallace—Mr. Hardy, do you ever send any of your children to Sunday School?

Mr. Hardy—I will merely say that my children go to Sunday School, but I do not send them. My children are at liberty to go to Sunday School if they wish to. But that is away from the subject. Such things as these practiced now-a-days were unknown among the ancient Baptists. We, as Old Baptists, do not practice these things, and the Baptists anciently did not practice them. People can have Sunday Schools if they want to, so far as I am concerned, but the

point that I make is that the Baptists in the olden days did not have such things. The first Sunday School in America was organized on January the 11th, 1791, and the first Sunday School in England was organized, we find, in 1781. It must be admitted that Baptists were in existence long previous to either of these dates. And in that connection I will refer to a pamphlet that I have here, which is an account of the first national Baptist Sunday School convention, the first national convention that these people ever had. I will read this in order to show you when any of you people go to these Sunday Schools, what you teach and what you are taught, what the intention of these institutions is.

This is an extract from an address of the Rev. A. E. Dickinson, from Virginia: "Brethren, let me urge you, as I would seek to urge myself, to greater earnestness in the work of saving little children. I would urge it by all the joys that come to us in this world from saving little children." Page 26: "I heard of a Sunday School superintendent that had been out looking up little ones and bringing them into the Sunday School, where one after another was converted. One day he was sent for to see a little child. The little boy said to him, 'I want to thank you, the last thing before I leave this world. When I go to heaven, I am going to tell Jesus it was you that put me in the way to heaven. It was you who saved me; and I am going to look out for you when you get up there. I will meet you, and take you by the hand, and carry you to Jesus, and say, Lord Jesus, here is the man that put me in the way to heaven.' O, I tell you, that superintendent went away with his heart almost bursting with joy at the thought of meeting that little fellow up at the pearly gate! If we are faithful, if these christain workers, from the North

and South, and East and West, are faithful in this work, laboring to save the little children, when you get up yonder at the shining gate, you will be surprised; for they will come from every direction. Every one will want to take you by the hand, and they will say, 'Come, I want to carry you to Jesus.' They will say, 'Lord Jesus, here is the man, and here is the woman, that put me in the way to heaven.'" Now, did the ancient Baptists ever have any such thing as set out here? Did the ancient Baptists ever tolerate such a thing as this? Certainly not; and, let me tell you, true Baptists to-day will not allow it. These are not the means by which sinners are saved at all. Here we are told of one of these little cherubs going to heaven and telling Jesus this and that, just as though Jesus did not know anything at all about it. The question arises right here, Is it our business to teach little children respecting the great character of God in this manner?

I will refer to one of their Sunday School papers, showing you what these people teach little children. The caption is, "Questions for the Youngest. Little ones, Jesus loves you. He died to save you. Ought you not to love him? Ought you not to try to live for him and please him? If you love him, you will. How mean and selfish it is for us to live just to please ourselves, and not to please Jesus. If we love him, we won't do so. If we love him, we will be new creatures, and try to do what will please Jesus all the time. Those who do not love God are God's enemies. God is angry with them. Jesus came and died to make God and them friends. For his sake God is willing to forgive and save them, if they will let him. He sends your minister and teacher to tell you so. They beg you to be reconciled to God." I do not be-

lieve God's ministers ever use any such arguments to children or anybody else. It is not what God's preachers were sent to do, to tell them that he would save them if they would only let him. Certainly such ideas were never promulgated in ancient days. There is nothing in the Bible that authorizes any such thing to be preached. For God's sake, brother Wallace, do not talk about the primitive Baptists teaching little children any such stuff as this. What wonder is it if I do not send my children to Sunday School? I certainly do not want my children to be taught any such nonsense as I find here; and it is just such as this, I have no doubt, that is found to-day in the Sunday Schools. For my part, I do not want my children to be taught that God made them, and after he did make them that they are more powerful than God himself.

Here is something from one of Mr. Wallace's little tracts that he is so enthusiastic about: "And what kind of books shall we select? Those, and those only, which in their character and influence, *harmonize with the great object of the school*. To lead the children to Christ, and then to instruct them in all the doctrines of the gospel, is the true aim of all Sunday School instruction. And no book should ever be admitted into the library that is not adapted, in some measure, to aid in the attainment of this object. And as the professed aim of Baptist Sunday School workers is to lead all the scholars first to become christians, and then to become Baptist christians, it is fitting that they should select for their libraries at least some Baptist books; and that they should admit none that teach pedobaptism directly or indirectly. Such books should no more be tolerated in a Baptist Sunday School library, than Pedobaptist sermons would be tolerated

in a Baptist pulpit; the latter would not be half so dangerous as the former."

The following is from an address delivered at the first Baptist Sunday School convention, before referred to :

"1. *The Sunday School is the moulder of public opinion.*

"2. *It is the conservator of public morals.*

"In the first place, the Sunday School is the moulder of public opinion.

"Public opinion, in this country at least, is no meaningless thing; it is a real entity; you may not be able to measure it in yards and feet, you may not be able to give its proportions or its weight avoirdupois, but after all, it is a tremendous power in the communities in which we live; it affects every relation in the community; there is nothing that pertains to the moral, political, social, or religious aspect of the community which this public opinion does not largely control.

"The Sunday School may be made, as a moulder of public opinion, a tremendous and powerful influence in controlling all right motives and securing all good results. You can reach, by striking early, the minds of those who are to grow up and control the next community, morally, politically, and financially."

It is stated here that they may control the next community by "striking early," that they may control it morally, politically, and financially. It would seem that the benefits to be derived from this process of "striking early" is the control they may exercise. It has been thrown up to me that we are opposed to such things, and that that is the reason that we are a small community. The process mentioned in this extract is the process practiced by the Catholics.

The Catholics have never wanted any more power than is stated here; that is, moral, political, and financial power. The Regular Baptists to-day believe in the Bible, and the Bible alone, and they have never been opposed to any plan that is authorized in the Bible. So far as being opposed to the Bible is concerned, I have to say that I have no doubt that there is one of them in this assembly to-day that has not got a Bible in his or her house.

I read from the *Western Recorder*, which is a Missionary Baptist paper: "God has promised to work with us, by us and through us, and that mightily: and if God works with me I can accomplish all things in accordance with his will. I speak of this mighty power wrought in us in conversion, or, rather, previous to conversion as an offset to that soul-destroying clap-trap which makes conversion a human work, consisting in memorizing the creed, joining the church, and desiring to flee from the wrath to come. If this is conversion, then I believe Satan himself is converted, for I believe he has memorized all our creeds; that he has dictated some of them. I believe that he is trying to join all our churches, and I know that he believes and has confessed that Jesus is the Christ, the holy one of God, and he certainly desires to flee from the wrath to come.

"Such ideas of conversion, though prevalent, are nevertheless degrading, heathenish, and fatal to the interests of the soul. I intend this as an attack on Baptist Sunday Schools and Baptist practice, for those that are without, God judgeth. Baptist Sunday Schools are becoming loose in sound doctrines—are departing from the faith. We have too many such converts in our churches, and too much of this teaching in our Sunday Schools."

This is from the pen of a contributor to the *Western Recorder*. He says that the devil has memorized their creeds—that is, the creeds of the Missionary Baptists; and more than that, the writer gives it as his opinion that the devil has dictated some of them. He even goes further than that, and says that he believes the devil is trying to join their churches. Now, I don't believe the devil is trying to join our church, because the devil don't believe our doctrine. The devil is emphatically in bitter opposition to our church. Here you see that the Missionary Baptists themselves are not agreed on these very points that I have spoken of. Here is one that I have quoted from that rebels against this Sunday School institution, and I think in a very forcible way. I have a few more quotations that I propose to make on this subject with a view of showing that these Sunday Schools are contrary to the teachings of the divine word of God, and I cannot see how any people having such institutions among them can claim to stand on the primitive grounds of the Old Baptists. I say that any people holding such things in their minds are not on the ground that the old Baptists stood on; and I am sure you cannot make any thinking man believe otherwise. I say here before God that this thing of teaching little children such things as these is contrary to the teaching of the divine word of God. I see before me people who think for themselves, and in God's name I advise them to look to what the Bible directs them to do, and not be guided by the clap-trap of false teachers. It seems to me that if the people would just take the Bible and be guided entirely by it they would find it sufficient. I say to my brethren now that we are opposed to these novel institutions of the Missionary Baptists, and we are opposed to them simply because

they are not taught in the Bible. We, as a denomination, profess to teach nothing but what the Bible teaches and authorizes to be taught.

---

REV. MR. WALLACE SAID:

GENTLEMEN Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: I have been feeling good all the time, but I am a sort of feeling bad now. I have been talking here now four days, and am getting tired. I wish some good sister would bring me a pillow to-morrow, so I may lie down and sleep while Mr. Hardy talks.

Says Mr. Hardy, "The devil won't try to join our church." Why, Mr. Hardy, he dragged you out of the church and you have remained out; he has been leading you into all manner of confusion, and, of course, he is not trying to join you. Nobody can dispute that.

The only thing that I see to notice in Mr. Hardy's last speech is in regard to the "spirit" matter, Says he, Of course, the Spirit is not going to strive with man after the man is dead. Now, did you ever hear such logic? Here is a people that had brought down the vengeance of high heaven on themselves, because of their wickedness, and God informs them that he will not let his Spirit strive with them any longer; but he tells Noah that he will give him and his family one hundred and twenty years, and during that period Noah preached to these people and prepared the ark for his own safety.

Then, Mr. Hardy gets off again on the Sunday School question. It has always been a strange thing to me that a man with reason would want to do better by the stock on his farm that has no soul than by his own children. If brother Hardy had a promising colt that he wanted to make a fine animal out of, what do you suppose he would do? Does not everybody know that he would train that colt? Of course, he would; but he would turn his children loose among all the wickedness of the world, instead of allowing them to read the word of God. To prevent this was the object of the Sunday School at the start, and nothing else. I have no doubt that there are errors taught in these Sunday Schools, just as I have no doubt, and indeed as I know, that there are errors taught in Mr. Hardy's church. I am not here to say that there has never been wrong taught in the Sunday School. Nay, further than that, I am not here to say that I have never taught that which was wrong from the pulpit. I have no doubt that I have been mistaken; but I know that I have always tried to do the very best I could, and if there has been any wrong taught by me it was my fault alone. The Sunday School; what a bugaboo it is to him! Take that institution as a whole, and I think I will prove that it is right.

In Deuteronomy iv. 9, we find the following: "Only take heed to thyself, and keep thy soul diligently, lest thou forget the things thine eyes have seen, and lest they depart from thy heart all the days of thy life; but teach them thy sons and thy son's sons: (10) specially the day thou stoodest before the Lord thy God in Horeb, when the Lord said unto me, Gather me the people together, and I will make them hear my words, that they may learn to fear me all the days.

that they shall live upon the earth, and that they may teach their children."

Yet with this language before him in the Bible, here is a man that is opposed to teaching his children in Sunday School or anywhere else. He and his people ridicule it, and heap their vituperations on this Sunday School institution, call it the devil's work, and prohibit their children from going to Sunday Schools. They let them follow every wickedness on the Sabbath day; they may go fishing, and hunting, and indulge in all such sports, with the effect of demoralizing them. Their children are told, in effect, that they might rather go to a horse-race, and, I have no doubt, to the gaming house, instead of the house of God. They turn their children loose on the Sabbath day to follow any inclination they may have, which is generally to their demoralization, instead of bringing up their young ones in the fear of God. They do all this and go further, they heap their vituperations on those that try to lead their children into the paths of righteousness, as God's divine word has emphatically commanded.

If Mr. Hardy and his people expect to set up their primitiveness because they have no Sunday Schools and are opposed to them, I think they are likely to be very much disappointed. The main question in regard to this is whether it is right according to God's divine word. See Deuteronomy xxxi. 11: "When all Israel is come to appear before the Lord thy God in the place which he shall choose, thou shalt read this law before all Israel in their hearing.

"(12) Gather the people together, men, and women, and children."

That is God's divine word. Where shall we gather them?

Brother Hardy has set his seal of opposition to this gathering of the children. He opposes it and repudiates it, and, more than that, he heaps his vituperations on it, and calls it the devil's work. After that let Mr. Hardy examine God's divine word as I have read it here.

Ezekiel xliv. 23: "And they shall teach my people the difference between the holy and profane, and cause them to discern between the unclean and the clean."

Psalms xxxiv. 1-10: "I will bless the Lord at all times; his praise shall continually be in my mouth.

"(2) My soul shall make her boast in the Lord; the humble shall hear thereof, and be glad.

"(3) O magnify the Lord with me, and let us exalt his name together.

"(4) I sought the Lord, and he heard me, and delivered me from all my fears.

"(5) They looked unto him, and were frightened; and their faces were not ashamed.

"(6) This poor man cried, and the Lord heard him, and saved him out of all his troubles.

"(7) The angel of the Lord encampeth round about them that fear him, and delivereth them.

"(8) O taste and see that the Lord is good; blessed is the man that trusteth in him.

"(9) O fear the Lord, ye his saints; for there is no want to those that fear him.

"(10) The young lions do lack, and suffer hunger; but they that seek the Lord shall not want any good thing."

Here the psalmist is addressing the sinner. He goes on to address the children. "Come, ye children, hearken unto me; I will teach you the fear of the Lord." Here is the divine

truth, the commandment, in fact, to train children, and to teach them in the fear of the Lord. But no, says Mr. Hardy, go on as you will, little children, and the Lord will call you in his own good time. This is no hypothetical assertion, for I have heard that very doctrine preached from the pulpit of these people. We all know they do not address the sinner. They say the sinner is dead, and not a subject of gospel address. Sunday Schools are almost universal; they are regarded by all denominations nearly as organizations for the purpose of teaching the youth of the country God's holy word. It is a great institution; and it is only these prejudiced people, that never visited them, that protest against them, and heap their vituperations upon them. The prejudices of these people are such that they do not want to know about it; and it is just such prejudices that people imbibe when they know nothing at all of a subject. Now I will leave it.

Deuteronomy xxx. 15-19: "(15) See, I have set before thee this day life and good, and death and evil:

"(16) In that I command thee this day to love the Lord thy God, to walk in his ways, and to keep his commandments, and his statutes, and his judgments, that thou mayest live and multiply: and the Lord thy God shall bless thee in the land whither thou goest to possess it.

"(17) But if thine heart turn away, so that thou wilt not hear, but shalt be drawn away, and worship other gods, and serve them;

"(18) I denounce unto you this day, that ye shall surely perish, and that ye shall not prolong your days upon the land, whither thou passest over Jordan to go to possess it.

"(19) I call heaven and earth to record this day against you, that I have set before you life and death, blessing and

cursing: therefore choose life, that thou and thy seed may live."

This is the word of God. The old prophet calls heaven and earth to witness that he had set these things before the children of Israel, and tells them to choose life rather than death. But, says Mr. Hardy, you cannot make choice to-day; you must remain in sin. Ah, but God's prophets taught a different doctrine. Mr. Hardy, you remember, said that I was afraid of the Bible. Well, I have taken a good deal from that holy book, and before I close I will make many more quotations to prove my position. I will show you from the Bible itself that Mr. Hardy does not preach its teachings, and that he has made nothing but a total failure of his argument since he began here. He has read some articles of faith and histories and books, and that has been his entire argument. I have laid down propositions that he has failed to answer, and I tell you he will never come up to time on them. These passages of Scripture that I have quoted he has never touched, and will not. He will treat them as he did my questions. They are diametrically opposed to his doctrine. Now I will pass to another point.

"Choose ye this day whom ye will serve." Why the Arminians are always preaching that. Here is the language of Joshua (xxiv. 15): "And if it seem evil unto you to serve the Lord, choose ye this day whom ye will serve, whether the gods which your fathers served that were on the other side of the flood, or the gods of the Amorites in whose land ye dwell: but as for me and my house, we will serve the Lord." I once heard an Antimission Baptist preach, and say that this was an Arminian text. This is the word of God. Joshua here goes on to tell what the Lord had done for this people;

how he had successfully carried them across the Red Sea, and had driven all the heathen nations before them, and now, says Joshua, that God has done all these things for you, "choose ye this day whom ye will serve."

"(16) And the people answered, and said, God forbid that we should forsake the Lord to serve other gods.

"(17) For the Lord our God, he it is that brought us up, and our fathers, out of the land of Egypt, from the house of bondage, and which did those great signs in our sight, and preserved us in all the way wherein we went, and among all the people through whom we passed.

"(18) And the Lord drove out from before us all the people, even the Amorites which dwelt in the land; therefore will we also serve the Lord; for he is our God.

"(19) And Joshua said unto the people, Ye cannot serve the Lord; for he is an holy God, he is a jealous God; he will not forgive your transgressions, nor your sins.

"(20) If ye forsake the Lord and serve strange gods, then he will turn and do you hurt, and consume you, after that he hath done you good.

"(21) And the people said unto Joshua, Nay; but we will serve the Lord.

"(22) And Joshua said unto the people, Ye are witnesses against yourselves that ye have chosen you the Lord to serve him."

I never have heard one of Mr. Hardy's people quote the whole of this. Then it goes on to speak about how Joshua set up a monument as a witness to show that the people had chosen life rather than death. Mr. Hardy's people will not preach this text because it is opposed to their system. No; they

cannot preach the whole gospel, as their own brother, Dr. Watson, charges them. I have referred to Watson, and made that charge on them, and Mr. Hardy has never made any attempt to answer it. Of course I do not expect them to acknowledge the corn; but there are here, in this audience, Methodists, Presbyterians, and Reformers, and they can judge. These Antimission Baptists are great on bragging beforehand. They remind me of an anecdote. I heard once about an Irishman, who was going along the road, and happening to look over into a field saw a very large bull. The Irishman thought it would be mighty funny to take the thing by the horns and wipe its nose. The more he thought about it, the funnier it got; and finally he jumped over the fence and grasped the bull by the horns. The Irishman was thrown over the fence. After he had picked himself up he remarked that it was a fine thing that he had had his laugh first. And it is so with these Antimission Baptists; it is a very good thing that they have had their brag and their laugh first before they tackled me. I tell you I think they will let this little Wallace alone hereafter.

Jeremiah xxix. 12-14. "Then shall ye call upon me, and ye shall go and pray unto me, and I will hearken unto you.

"(13) And ye shall seek me and find me, when ye shall search for me with all your heart.

"(14) And I will be found of you, saith the Lord; and I will turn away your captivity, and I will gather you from all the nations, and from all the places whither I have driven you, saith the Lord; and I will bring you again unto the place whence I caused you to be carried away captive."

1st Samuel x. 19: "And ye have this day rejected your God, who himself saved you out of all your adversities, and

your tribulations; and ye have said unto him, Nay, but set a king over us. Now, therefore, present yourselves before the Lord by your tribes, and by your thousands."

Just one more quotation, and I will close for the evening.

Jeremiah xiii. 10: "This evil people, which refuse to hear my words, which walk in the imagination of their heart, and walk after other gods, to serve them, and to worship them, shall even be as this girdle, which is good for nothing."

Here was a people rejecting God. They refused to worship the living God. They speak of reprobation. I will show you that it is only those that reject the New Testament that are reprobated. I will show you where reprobation takes place. I ask the question again, Mr. Hardy, whether a portion of God's people were reprobated from eternity. I will not touch that question until to-morrow, as I have taken up so much time in what I have already said.

I return my thanks, ladies and gentlemen, for your kind and close attention since I have been on my line of defense, and hope you will still continue it; and to-morrow I hope you will all come up as near to me as you can, for I intend to rouse up things then. I will show you protracted meetings and missionary meetings away back long before Mr. Hardy's denomination had any existence. I desire to have your full attention. Mr. Hardy has tried to find out something from the *Baptist Banner*, and I just wish to say that I consider that I have an equal right to quote from the *Baptist Signs of the Times*.

[The discussion was then adjourned until the next day at 10 o'clock, A. M.]

## ELDER HARDY SAID:

[Fifth Day—Morning Session.]

[Services were opened with prayer by Mr. Fletcher. The rules governing the debate were then read by Mr. Moderator Perkins.]

GENTLEMEN Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: I am again before you to proceed in my usual manner.

I desire, in the first place, to say a few words in regard to this subject of the Sunday Schools. You will, probably, remember that at the conclusion of my last speech on yesterday evening that I was treating on this subject, and that when my brother Wallace followed me he made an effort to misrepresent what I had said, and he endeavored to impress it on the minds of this people that I was opposed to my children going to Sunday School in order to hear the reading of the word of God. This is an utter mistake. I am not opposed to my children reading, or hearing read, the Bible, at any time or place. But, so far as that is concerned, my children can read the Bible as well at their own home as in any Sunday School, and without running the risk of being taught anything that is not in the Bible. I have Bibles myself at home in plenty for my children to read; and, so far as reading the Bible is concerned, they have every opportunity; and every man's children who has read the word of God in his house have the same opportunity of reading the Scriptures at home that they would have in any Sunday School. What I object to in Sunday Schools chiefly is the teaching of sectarianism, and teaching them that God would

save them if they would only let him. So far as I am concerned, I do not want my children taught in any such manner.

I referred on yesterday to the Acts of the Apostles, iv. 13, and I showed you that the statement there was that the Apostles that spoke were ignorant and unlearned men. Mr. Wallace undertook to dispute that statement in the Bible; he went so far as to say that it was false; that these men were learned men. Mr. Wallace may say himself that they were learned men, but the Bible says emphatically that they were not. Mr. Wallace has disputed everything that I have said in this debate; he has disputed his own historians even, when I would make a point from them; and now he has gone to the extent of disputing the Bible. Again, Mr. Wallace has said that infant baptism is taught in the present translation of the Bible that we use, and that consequently he does not believe it; and he comes up here and declares positively that it is not a true translation. Well, if he denies the Bible in part, there is no use in speculating as to how much of it he does believe. If Mr. Wallace asserts here that a portion of the Bible is wrong, why does not he tell us how much of it he believes? This is Mr. Wallace's position, notwithstanding he has been telling us with such emphasis that he is going into the Bible. I have got a Bible that contains every word that his Bible does, I suppose, unless Mr. Wallace has a Greek copy here which he understands. He says that the English translation of the Bible is wrong. I presume that he intends to say that the Greek copy contains more or better matter. I suppose that Mr. Wallace has the Bible in the original language, because on yesterday he went on to use two or three foreign words, that, for my part, I am

willing to admit I did not understand, and therefore I am not ready to dispute; I did not know anything at all about them, and he may have given them all right or he may not.

I refer to Genesis iii. 22-24: "And the Lord God said, Behold, the man has become as one of us, to know good and evil: and now, lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live forever:

"(23) Therefore the Lord God sent him forth from the garden of Eden, to till the ground from whence he was taken.

"(24) So he drove out the man; and he placed at the east of the garden of Eden cherubims, and a flaming sword which turned every way, to keep the way of the tree of life."

What construction does Mr. Wallace put on this language? If I understood him aright, it was not to keep the way of the tree of life, lest man should reach forth his hand, but he thought a way was opened up here by which man could reach forth his hand and live forever, and that the object of this flaming sword was to keep the devil away, so that man could reach forth and partake of eternal life. Well, I do not understand it that way, and I do not think any intelligent person who reads this text will take such a view of it.

Mr. Wallace quoted a number of Scripture passages in the Old Testament, which I suppose he meant to be a reply to my remarks on the Sunday School institution. If I understood Mr. Wallace, he said he was going to prove by the Bible that the institution of the Sunday School is right. I leave it to this audience to say whether he brought out anything that had a tendency in that direction at all. Did he find any place in the Bible where it said anything about Sunday School? No, sir; nor can he do it. These are

things of recent origin. The first of the kind that was ever organized in the known world was in the year 1781; and Mr. Wallace knew very well when he said he intended to prove it by the Bible, that he could not show by history the existence of Sunday Schools further back than that year. He found where men, women, and children assembled together. Very well. We are assembled here to-day, but I do not see anything in the shape of a Sunday School in that. Then what has he done with his quotations from the Old Testament? Has he accomplished his object? He goes there in an effort to prove the correctness of his doctrine. Now, bear in mind that he agreed with me in the outset as to this matter of grace. He said he believed as much in grace as I did, and that he did not believe in a conditional plan of salvation. I have told you all here just how much I believe in grace; and if Mr. Wallace believes as much on that point as I do, why does not he say what he does believe, or, at any rate, state how much of that doctrine he does indorse? I believe that everything pertaining to the salvation of the sinner is the gift of God from first to last. There is nothing conditional whatever in it. People cannot divide the word of truth; it is either true or untrue, and it cannot be divided. We cannot mix law and the gospel together, and then undertake to preach law for gospel. Mr. Wallace tried to make the impression here that when he comes to the Old Testament that that is what you are required to be governed by, and that by obeying this you will obtain eternal life. Now, there is one expression that I want you to notice carefully. It has been said that if we offend in one point, we are guilty of the whole. I take the position here that this law spoken of—that is, the old covenant—is not the covenant under

which we are at the present. Have not I quoted here, and proved to you, that Jesus says that He will make a new covenant? "I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and the house of Judah." And he goes on to say that it is not in accordance with the old covenant. If it is not in accordance with the old covenant, it certainly must be different from it; and if the old covenant was unconditional, the new covenant is conditional; and if the old was conditional, then the new must be unconditional. Now, Mr. Wallace, which ground will you take here? It is very clear that you cannot take the position that both covenants were conditional. So these quotations that Mr. Wallace has been making refer undoubtedly to the house of Israel. We see that there were many things required of these people under the law, and we are told that if they violated that law, they were put to death; but if they obeyed the law, their land was to prosper and bring forth much fruit. Now, this question: If these people disobeyed, did God say they would go to hell? If these people obeyed, did he say they would live and go to heaven? Here it is a case of obey, and live; disobey, and die. It is here, and here alone, that Mr. Wallace undertakes to prove his system, and he cannot find grounds to prove it anywhere else. But if we are guilty in one particular, we are guilty of the whole, says he. Well, if that is the case, and if that is the only condition under which we can be saved, none of us will ever receive salvation; for there is no man but who has broken the law in some particular.

Exodus xxxv. 2, 3: "Six days shall work be done, but on the seventh day there shall be to you an holy day, a sabbath of rest to the Lord: whosoever doeth work therein shall be put to death.

“(3) Ye shall kindle no fire throughout your habitation upon the sabbath day.”

Will Mr. Wallace come up here and tell this people whether we are under the law to-day? and if we are, let me ask whether if we light a fire on the sabbath day we shall be put to death? Suppose Mr. Wallace should go off on a Sunday on an engagement to preach, and when he came back he discovered that his wife had been kindling fires on the sabbath day; if he were governed by this law would he put his wife to death? If Mr. Wallace were to undertake to govern himself by this law it would be his christian duty to stone his wife to death. It is the merest nonsense, and the Bible-writers knew better than that. I tell you that the Gentiles were never under this law. This law was given to the Jews as a nation. They were threatened with damnation for a violation of the law, and promised salvation for obedience to it. It was with them a matter of life and death; and, in accordance with that, we find where there were whole masses put to death, in consequence of having violated that law. I think this enough on that point.

Mr. Wallace has assured us time and again that he was going to the Bible to prove his position. It is fortunate that Mr. Wallace and I are going in the same direction in that respect; for I am going to the Bible, too. But I want to make a few remarks first. My understanding is that in the outset, and as has been read here every morning, that in this debate I affirm the proposition laid down, namely, that the Regular Baptist is the Church of Christ, and that they have come up by regular succession from the days of the Apostles to the present time, and that Mr. Wallace denies it. I think I have proved that we, as a people, at the present time,

maintain the practices and doctrines of the ancient Baptists ; and I am sure Mr. Wallace has failed to disprove it, as I understand to have been his part to do if it could be done. For I have always understood it was the purpose of the negative to follow the affirmative and attempt to disprove his arguments. Mr. Wallace has utterly failed, in my opinion, to do this. You will remember that at the conclusion of my first hour speech in the beginning of this debate, after I had laid the groundwork of my argument, that in reply to it he got up and read off a long list of questions that he had written out, and which he demanded that I should answer. So far as the questions themselves were concerned, they were entirely harmless, but I did not take up any time in answering them, because it was not my duty to follow Mr. Wallace ; but, on the contrary, it was his duty to follow my arguments, and show where I was wrong, or where I had failed to prove any statement that I had made. Incidentally I have answered some of his questions, and it would have been quite an easy matter to have answered the rest of them if we had had the time and I had felt the disposition to do so ; but it would have been useless, for these questions had absolutely nothing to do with this discussion. These questions of Mr. Wallace seem to have afforded him a great deal of amusement. If it was his intention to use them with the purpose to avoid answering my arguments, I suppose they have served his purpose to his own satisfaction. To my mind he has certainly made no attempt to answer any argument I have made.

Now for the Bible. I am going to take up the Scriptures to prove the old doctrine of the Baptists. I shall not depart from that point ; and if I do, I trust the Moderators will

check me. I quote from John iii. 16: "For God\* so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." Now, I know that it seems strange that an Old Baptist should quote that text in order to prove his system, but I tell you it takes the whole Bible to support any system of theology. I want to make a short argument here in regard to the love of God that is referred to in this quotation. It says that God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish. Bear in mind that these Missionary Baptists pretend to take the Scriptures to prove their doctrine. Let us see if it does it. They undertake to prove from the Bible that the entire race of man is embraced in the eternal love of God. The Bible does prove that position or it does not prove it. I would like Mr. Wallace to answer my one question on this point. If the race of man was embraced in the eternal love of God, I would like Mr. Wallace to tell me how they got out of the eternal love of God; tell me how any portion of the race of man got out of the eternal love of God if they were all embraced in it. God is unchangeable—even Mr. Wallace has not undertaken to deny that; and when God loves us, he loves us forever. What God loves now God has loved from the beginning, and will love forever. There can be no change, for God is unchangeable; and if all the race of man was embraced in his eternal love, and if a portion of the race of man sinks down into eternal damnation; God loves that portion that sinks down to hell; for if we take the position that God loves the entire race of man, and he is an unchangeable God, he must love that portion of the race that is in hell, for God is unchangeable.

I shall make a few remarks now on the subject of redemption. Galatians iii. 13: "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us." Mr. Wallace, tell me, is that the truth? Tell me, Mr. Wallace, who this "us" is? You profess, Mr. Wallace, to be something of a grammarian. Then, tell me if the word "us" here refers to the entire race of man, or if it refers to a part. There must be an intermediate space between part and all; and if Christ has redeemed us from the curse of the law, I want to know if we have gotten out from under the sentence of the law. If he has redeemed us from under the curse of the law, if Christ has satisfied the law, and if we are justified in the eyes of the Lord, I want you, Mr. Wallace, to tell me by what law any part of the race of man goes to hell. If you take the position that Christ has redeemed all of us, you had better let the Universalists alone, for that is their very doctrine. What is atonement? Answer me, Mr. Wallace, what is atonement? You have said that we, as a people, had no learned men among us, but, as everybody knows, you got most of your education from one of our men; and as there is no intention of casting a reflection on your intelligence, we will let that statement drop, merely saying that we have right here a thorough scholar, who understands, as I believe, the Greek language. From all the information I have been able to get, my understanding of the word "atonement" means satisfaction, or, rather, that satisfaction must be rendered before there can be atonement. Has satisfaction been rendered for all the race of men? If there has been, tell me how any portion of us can go to hell.

Romans v. 8-10: "But God commendeth his love towards us, in that while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us.

“(9) Much more then, being now justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him.

“(10) For if when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son; much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life.”

Please notice the words “much more” here. What is meant? Does it mean that all having been redeemed, some will be left to perish? No; that is not the truth of the Bible. “Much more then, being justified by his blood, we shall be saved.” I take the position that everybody justified by the blood of Christ alone shall be saved. Is that Old Baptist doctrine or not?

Mr. Wallace—O, we all know that.

Mr. Hardy—Then why don't you acknowledge it?

Mr. Wallace—That is Old Baptist doctrine, I mean.

Mr. Hardy—I thought you meant to say you all knew it was true, and indeed I expect you do. These Missionary Baptists take the position that Christ died for all, for the entire race of man, in order to give all a chance. Let me make a few remarks here. I would like to know if this congregation believe to day that the Lord Jesus Christ, when he suffered, bled and died on the cross, atoned for the sins of the entire race of man, so that they might all be saved. How long did the world stand before the advent of Christ? I believe that it had stood about four thousand years. If that was the case, what became of the people that died previous to the coming of Christ? Will my brother say that they all went to heaven? Will he admit that a portion of this people sinks down to eternal destruction, or does he claim that by the death of Christ they were all saved? Mr. Wallace undoubtedly believes that the Bible teaches that a certain por-

tion of the race of man goes to destruction. Admitting that a portion of the race of man before the coming of Christ sank down to eternal destruction, tell me if when Christ came, and suffered and died on the cross, he redeemed those that were already in hell, or gave them a chance for salvation. However, I do not think there is any necessity for pursuing this subject any further. I know that Mr. Wallace will not undertake to answer that, believing as he does, between now and next Christmas.

Matthew i. 21: "And she shall bring forth a son, and thou shalt call his name JESUS: for he shall save his people from their sins." What is the angel speaking of here? for as you are aware, this is the declaration of the angel that appeared to Joseph before the Savior was born. This shows the plan of salvation that was in the mind of God before Jesus was born into the world. Here the angel appears to Joseph before the birth of Christ, and says that she *shall* bring forth a son, "and thou *shalt* call his name JESUS." I do not suppose that Mr. Wallace will dispute with me about the first two "shalls" here, that Mary *shall* bring forth a son, and his name *shall* be called Jesus. But I suppose when he comes to the third "shall"—"and he *shall* save his people"—that will be a little too much for him. Three "shalls" in rotation are more than his people can swallow. But we Old Baptists believe them all, and we would believe them if there were forty right in succession. Mr. Wallace sneers at what he calls the ignorance of the Old Baptists. Well, I am glad the Old Baptists have no more sense than to believe the Bible. But what is the angel talking about when he says that Jesus shall save his people? He does not say if they will use means; it is not if they will that Jesus will save them, but the angel

positively declares here that Jesus *shall* save his people. Let us notice this a little further. Bear in mind that the passage says that "he *shall* save his people." Does not that imply that there is a people that are not his? Is the meaning conveyed that all the people are his? Between these you have to take one of the two positions. If a part is his, then there must be a part that is not his. If there is a part that is to be saved, there is a part that will not be saved, and nobody disputes that there is a part that will not be saved. If Mr. Wallace is to consider this passage to mean that all will be saved, he might as well at once try to make Universalists out of us; and if he acknowledges that, it is time for him to stop attacking these Universalists. But God has said that he will save his people, and there is not one single solitary condition attached to it. The angel did not say that Jesus will do so and so if we do so and so; there is nothing of that kind at all. I want to call your attention particularly to that fact. I read on yesterday, and showed you the new covenant, where it says that you shall not teach every man his brother and every man his neighbor; and right in the face of that command these Missionaries propose to teach every man his brother and every man his neighbor. If Mr. Wallace proposes to prove his doctrine from the Bible, he will first have to get over that point. They cannot explain it, and they have been going in the face of that command in point blank contradiction to what the Bible says. Jesus says we shall not do this thing, and I have always been disposed to believe what Jesus says.

REV. MR. WALLACE SAID:

GENTLEMEN Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: I am before you this morning feeling better than ever, notwithstanding we have a scholar here [indicating Elder Worlds] to-day. There has been a scholar winking behind me, as his people have been doing ever since we commenced on Monday morning. I suppose he is here in the character of the Greek scholar. Well, he tried his Greek on me in Livingston County, but it did not work. Never mind, brother Worlds; your winking does you good, I suppose, and it does me no harm. If you think you can scare me by it, you are fooling away your time.

The first thing I notice in Mr. Hardy's speech is what he gets off about Peter and John, and his saying that I denied the Bible. Did not I show to this people that Peter and John were not unlearned men, for did not I show that Peter and John had been educated by the best theological Teacher that was ever on earth for three years before they went to preach the gospel? Did not I show how they wrote their epistles in the Greek language, which was not their mother tongue? And if they did that, how could they have been uneducated men?

Then again, I never said that infant baptism was taught in the Bible. I said that the word "baptism" in the original meant to sprinkle or pour, and I came to refer to that because of Mr. Hardy's running us on my remarks about the translation of the Bible. I told him that he was not an Old

Baptist, because he did not protest against the translation as it was first brought out. The Old Baptists would not have anything to do with the first translation of the Bible. Brother Worlds knows that that translation was made in the interest of the Episcopalian Church, and the Old Baptists would have nothing to do with it. Brother Worlds is probably a great scholar, and if he is, he knows that to be the fact. But what is the use of bringing up that question again? It was settled conclusively on yesterday.

Then, we Missionary Baptists are governed by the old Scriptures, says brother Hardy. There is no promise of eternal life in the old Scriptures, says he. Now, is not that theology? Ask your scholar to tell you if there is no promise of eternal life in the old Scriptures. Mr. Hardy asked me the question, What became of the people who died before Christ came into the world to save sinners? He says there is nothing but law in the old Scriptures, and no promise of eternal life. He says what is in the Old Testament about that is a temporal affair. I really do not want to go to the trouble of answering such questions as these.

Then he goes on about my questions, that I had submitted to him a lot of written questions. That is all very well; but I told him emphatically that he would not answer them, because some of them he could not answer, and others he would not answer because they were opposed to his doctrine. Were they not fair questions? Did I not give him two days and a half in which to answer them, and did not I predict to this congregation that he would not answer them? I told you that I expected to depart from the requirements of logic and assume the burden of proof, and so perform a work of supere-

rogation and prove the negative. And now Mr. Hardy comes up and says that I have not touched on any of his arguments. Well, ladies and gentlemen, you that have listened to this argument must be the judges of that, and those that have not heard will be able to judge for themselves when this debate is printed.

Mr. Hardy dwells mightily on his "shalls" and "wills." Well, I put one to him the other day when I asked him while Paul was writing to his son, Timothy, in the ministry, when he commands him in regard to prayer, that prayer and supplication should be made for all men, and goes on to show why, and he winds up with, "for he will have all men to be saved." I want Mr. Hardy to answer me if this was one of God's decretive "wills." Why did he not answer that when he was going on at such a rate about his "wills" and "shalls?" Here we find the Apostle saying that it is good and acceptable in the sight of the Savior, because "he will have all men to be saved." Answer me, Is this one of God's decretive wills?

But there are some other little things here that I will bring up after awhile in the course of my presentation of my negative proof. What little time I have I propose to devote to the Scriptures. I have so far gotten from the beginning of the Bible up to Psalms.

The old Bible, says Mr. Hardy, is the Missionaries' Bible. Now, says Psalms (xxii. 26), "The meek shall eat and be satisfied; they shall praise the Lord that seek him; your heart shall live forever.

"(27) All the ends of the world shall remember and turn unto the Lord; and all the kindreds of the nations shall worship before thee."

This is the missionary doctrine that we have preached throughout this land, and we preach no other doctrine. Mr. Hardy says it was not the doctrine of the Old Baptists to warn sinners to flee the wrath to come. Mr. Hardy has not touched this thing yet.

Now let us hear what the old prophet Isaiah has to say: "Come now and let us reason together, saith the Lord: though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow: though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool.

"(19) If ye be willing and obedient, ye shall eat the good of the land:

"(20) But if ye refuse, ye shall be devoured with the sword: for the mouth of the Lord has spoken it."

But says Mr. Hardy, O! this is only temporal. God has said emphatically by the mouth of his prophet, and commands us to preach it to the people, for he says, "As I live I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked." That is temporal, too, I suppose.

Now, here again, in Isaiah lv. 7: "Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts: and let him return unto the Lord, and he will have mercy upon him; and to our God, for he will abundantly pardon." Now, every scholar knows that the verb "will" is in the active voice. Now, says the prophet, "Look unto me, all ye ends of the earth." Is not that word in the active voice also? "And be ye saved."—Is not the verb "be" in the passive voice there? But these people say the sinner cannot act; no, he is dead, they say. But God has made man a rational creature, capable of receiving rewards and promises. He has promised it will be well with the righteous and ill with the wicked. A man has a soul susceptible of divine impression, and God rules him by

these things. A man that cannot understand that ought to be put in one of brother Hardy's Sunday Schools and learn something. Why, a ten year old boy has better sense than that.

Now, we will have some Missionary doctrine.

Isaiah ii. 2: "And it shall come to pass in the last days, that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills: and all nations shall flow unto it.

"(3) And many people shall go and say, Come, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths: for out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem."

Let us have some more.

Isaiah xxxii. 15: "Until the Spirit shall be poured upon us from on high, and the wilderness be a fruitful field, and the fruitful field be counted for a forest.

"(16) The judgment shall dwell in the wilderness, and righteousness remain in the fruitful field.

"(17) And the work of righteousness shall be peace: and the effect of righteousness, quietness and assurance forever.

"(18) And my people shall dwell in a peaceable habitation, and in sure dwellings, and in quiet resting places."

Isaiah xlv. 22: "Look unto me and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth: for I am God, and there is none else."

Isaiah lv. 6: "Seek ye the Lord while he may be found." Now, perhaps the verb "seek" there is in the passive voice, perhaps Mr. Hardy will say that; "Call ye upon him while he is near, and he will abundantly pardon."

Now, did you ever hear any such Scripture quoted from an

Antimission pulpit? I want to know how often you have heard it quoted among Antimission Baptists.

Mr. Watkins—I have heard it a thousand times.

Mr. Wallace—Keep cool, my friend. I know this is hurting you and I am sorry for it, but I cannot help it.

Now, turn to Ezekiel xviii. 31: “Cast away from you all your transgressions, whereby ye have transgressed: and make you a new heart and a new spirit: for why will ye die, O house of Israel?”

“(32) For I have no pleasure in the death of him that dieth, saith the Lord God: wherefore turn yourselves, and live ye.”

I heard the question once asked from one of their pulpits, Why is it that the sinner dies? The only answer given was that it seemed good in the sight of God; that it was because it seemed good to him, when God’s divine word emphatically says he has no pleasure in the death of the wicked. I have already told you that the material difference between these people and us is, that they preach salvation by grace and damnation by the decrees of God, while our people preach salvation by grace and damnation by works. I have asked Mr. Hardy as to that point before. Has he ever replied to it? Never.

Now, I will turn to Ezekiel xxxiii. 11: “Say unto them, As I live, saith the Lord God, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked; but that the wicked turn from his way and live: turn ye, turn ye from your evil ways: for why will ye die, O house of Israel?” Perhaps they will say that this language, “turn ye,” is also in the passive voice. I have no further comment to make here.

And in Joel ii. 28 there is some more Missionary doctrine:

“And it shall come to pass afterward, that I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh; and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, your old men shall dream dreams, your young men shall see visions:

“(29) And also upon the servants and upon the hand-maids in those days will I pour out my Spirit.”

• Micah iv. 1: “But in the last days it shall come to pass, that the mountain of the house of the Lord shall be established in the top of the mountains, and it shall be exalted above the hills: and people shall flow unto it.

“(2) And many nations shall come.”—Now that cannot have any reference to the Antimission Baptists, because theirs is but one nation; there were but forty thousand of them, and they have died until there are now but twenty-four thousand, and they are still dying, and they would be dead altogether if it was not for accessions from our churches. That is what keeps them up, and consequently this language cannot refer to them, because there is but one nation of them. “And many nations shall come and say, Come, let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, and to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths; for the law shall go forth of Zion, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem.”

Now, Zechariah i. 2: “The Lord hath been sore displeased with your fathers.

“(3) Therefore, say unto them, Thus saith the Lord of hosts: Turn ye unto me, saith the Lord of hosts, and I will turn unto you, saith the Lord of hosts.” Here he is enjoined to turn unto the Lord, and it is promised that the Lord will turn unto him. But these people of Mr. Hardy’s say that a sinner cannot do that, but that the sinner is just as dead as

a rock, and one of them proposed to join our church if he could make a rock. They say if no man can make rock I am with them.

Zechariah iv. 6: "Then he answered and spake unto me, saying, This is the word of the Lord unto Zerubbabel, saying, Not by might, nor by power, but by my Spirit, saith the Lord of hosts.

"(7) Who art thou, O great mountain? before Zerubbabel thou shalt become a plain: and he shall bring forth the headstone thereof with shoutings, crying, Grace, grace unto it.

"(8) Moreover the word of the Lord came unto me saying,

"(9) The hands of Zerubbabel have laid the foundation of this house; his hands shall also finish it; and thou shalt know the Lord of hosts hath sent me unto you." All intelligent people agree that this refers to the heathen nation.

Here is more Missionary doctrine from Malachi i. 11: "For from the rising of the sun even unto the going down of the same, my name shall be great among the Gentiles; and in every place incense shall be offered unto my name, and a pure offering: for my name shall be great among the heathen, saith the Lord of hosts."

God has commanded that his gospel be preached to every creature among the heathen. But these people of Mr. Hardy have never done any such thing as that in their lives. Now, brother Hardy said he believed in a Bible plan of missions, and I have called upon him time and again to state what that plan was. Now, I told him if I was a man who will say that he believes in a plan, and don't want any plan, it shows that he is a dodger and nothing else, because he knows the Bible teaches it, and that is why they believe in a Bible plan.

Now, I am through with the Old Testament, in making reference to it in support of the positions I have maintained. I do not think brother Hardy will ever touch on these quotations. Now, once I spoke of theological teachers, and in support of my position in that matter I will go to the Bible again. Jesus Christ was not a theological teacher, but he was a model missionary. If he had been an antimissionary, he would not have gone to foreign countries; he would not have left his own land and gone to preach the gospel to the heathen. And not only was Jesus Christ a missionary, but the angels from heaven were missionaries; for did they not go to Bethlehem, and say to the shepherds, "Fear not; for behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people?" But Mr. Hardy says, O no, the Lord Jesus has a little flock. But observe here the expression is to *all* people. "And the angel said unto them, Fear not; for behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to *all* people."

"(11) For unto you is born this day, in the city of David, a Savior, which is Christ the Lord.

"(12) And this shall be a sign unto you; Ye shall find the babe wrapped in swaddling clothes, lying in a manger."

It was not a proclamation to any one man or set of men that the heavens resounded with the praising of God for his merciful character to the children of men, for it is said, "And suddenly there was with the angel a multitude of the heavenly host praising God, and saying, Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will toward men." And not only this, but Simeon heard it and said, "Lord, now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace, according to thy word: for mine eyes have seen thy salvation, which thou hast pre-

pared before the face of all people; a light to lighten the Gentiles, and the glory of thy people Israel." Just the doctrine that John the Baptist taught, that Jesus Christ taught, and here are the Antimissionary Baptists denying it, and saying that the sinner is not the subject of gospel address, and consequently cannot hear the gospel; that the gospel is not for the enlightenment of the minds of the human family. They deny that the Spirit of God can exert its influence on the human heart. Now they say that the Spirit of the Lord must quicken us while we are in a state of sin. He used the word "quicken," meaning to convince, and when the Spirit did convince the world, and sent good will into the world, the sinner is convinced of his sin. I have no doubt there are people before me to-day that do not claim to be righteous. But the Spirit of God has convinced you of your sin, and consequently the spirit of the gospel of the living God comes to you and says if you believe not that I am he, you shall die in your sin. Here Jesus makes salvation depend on the belief of the truth, and he tells them if you believe not you shall die. This is condemnation that light is come into the world, that men may love darkness rather than light. And this, my brother says, is because the sinner is under the law. I tell you the law has been met in the person of Jesus Christ. He said he came to fulfill the law, and that not one jot or tittle shall pass until all is fulfilled. But Mr. Hardy says God never made provision for the sinner, and that he must sink down into eternal night, and that Jesus Christ cannot help him, because it pleased God to leave him out of the covenant. If that were true, could not the sinner say to God at the judgment day, Why did you make me thus? You made me a sinner and I could not help myself. No, sir, God

will not allow such a plea as that to be made. If the sinner is condemned he will be forced to acknowledge that his condemnation is just, and he will not be able to charge God with it; he will never charge God with his condemnation. I wish to God you all would pay attention to the teachings of the word here to-day, and not listen to what these people tell you that God will call you in his own good time. Do not let them tell you not to be uneasy, or that if you are to be called you will be called. I know numbers of these people who have waited for the Lord's time to come, and the Lord has never come to them, and they have gone to their graves without the hope of salvation. I tell you that God's divine truth teaches that a sinner shall not wait, but will come unto him, and if he does not come the Lord holds him responsible for all his sins.

[The Moderator informed the speaker that his time was up.]

---

### ELDER HARDY SAID:

I JUST want to ask this intelligent congregation if brother Wallace, according to my request, took up my Scripture quotations and arguments and answered them at all? He said in the outset that he believed salvation was unconditional, and he challenged me to charge him with believing in a conditional plan. He said he believed in the grace plan as much as I did, and now he has gone to the Scriptures in an endeavor to prove that salvation is conditional, and depends on a certain work to be performed on the part of the sinner

in order to receive eternal salvation. Now, I take the position that the Scriptures produced by him have no reference to the eternal plan of salvation whatever. He has found life and death here, he has found eternal death and eternal life. He said he was going to prove eternal life, and I doubt whether he can find his proof in the whole Scriptures. Now, I want to ask him again, right here, I want him to tell this people whether the Lord Jesus Christ is the Savior of sinners, or whether the sinners save themselves, or whether the work belongs to the two combined. He then makes a great to-do about my saying he denied the Scriptures. I merely said that he denied our translation of the Scriptures and said that it was not true, and this statement will be borne out by what he says is the true translation of the word "baptism." I leave that point to be proved by the report of this debate.

Then he goes back to Cain and Abel, but I have answered that part of his argument so often already that I do not see the necessity of following him through it again. He has not proved that we are required to read the Scriptures in order to eternal life. He has found life and death and heathen and hell. But the Bible says by the deeds of the law no flesh shall be justified. He has tried to get flesh justified by the deeds.

And again, about this Cain and Abel matter. I want to notice one point that has run through this discussion, the declaration that God was no respecter of persons. The Bible says so; that is true. While the Bible says that God is no respecter of persons in one sense, there is a sense in which he is. Peter says, when he went over to the Gentile nations, "I present the truth that God is no respecter of persons, but in every nation he that fears God is accepted of

him." Suppose we accept that in the broad sense and say that God is no respecter of persons. We see then that he has as much respect for one person as for another. Then, if he has as much respect for one as for another, I want to know why he desires sinners to be converted, if he has as much respect for them in sin as in conversion. Now, that is not the sense which the Bible teaches. You will remember that Cain and Abel made an offering, and the Bible says that Abel and his offering were accepted, while Cain and his offering were rejected. If the person had been left out, and the language had reference only to the offering, there might be some sense in what Mr. Wallace says, but you will notice that the person as well as the offering is included. God had respect for Abel and his offering, but for Cain and his offering he had no respect, neither for his offering nor his person. But, says one, I can tell you the reason of that; it is because Abel offered in faith and Cain did not. The principle then is admitted here that faith was the gift of God, and if it was the gift of God, he has to know us before we can receive it; and if he gave Abel faith and none to Cain, tell me, why didn't he do it?

Then Mr. Wallace comes up with his text, "Let the wicked forsake his ways, and the unrighteous man his thoughts, and let him return to the Lord." Mr. Wallace says that he never heard that text given by the Old Baptists from their pulpits. In answer to that I say I have heard it time and again. But this Scripture is used by them, and they apply it to the dead sinner. The language is, "Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts, and let them return to the Lord, and he will have mercy, and he will abundantly pardon." But applying it to sinners there is one difficulty in

the way which he can probably remove. The text says, "let them return to the Lord." Now, I want him to tell this people if that language does not mean that these people who were commanded to return had been to the Lord before. I cannot see how we can return to a place we have never been in. But this people, as I remarked before, were governed by the law. The law required them to be obedient. It laid down to them what they were to do, and if they violated that law they had to suffer death. They were commanded to keep the sabbath day holy; not to do any sort of work, not even to kindle a fire, and if they did they were liable to the penalty of death. We have an instance related in the Bible where violators of the law were stoned to death for picking up sticks on the sabbath day. Now, while these people were governed by the law and were obedient to the law, their lives were preserved and the land prospered; but when they violated it, the penalty was death. When the laws of our land at the present day are violated, and the penalty of such violation is death, that is the end of it. But they had not fallen from grace at all. Now, if my brother Wallace has found anything in the Scriptures saying that salvation was conditional, he has failed to show it here.

I want to ask this intelligent congregation another question. I want to know if the Bible contradicts itself. Are there any contradictions in the Bible? Now I am not guessing at this thing at all in setting up the doctrine of salvation by grace. I know I can prove it, and if I prove that, and he proves his doctrine of salvation by grace and works, then the conclusion is inevitable that there are two systems taught in the Bible, and that the Bible contradicts itself. Now, the Apostle Paul was a learned man of his day, and he says

that salvation is by grace and not of works ; if it is by works, it is not by grace. Now, Paul would not let them mix up grace and works together in order to salvation ; and if the brother wants to deny the grace plan, let him come up to his works and let us have the grace plan. If he don't want to have works and grace mixed up together, do as Paul did, and come up and say it is by grace. When Mr. Wallace said that salvation was partly by grace and partly by works, he positively contradicts the Bible, and every reader of the Bible knows it. Paul says distinctly it is by grace, it is not of works ; if it is by works it is not of grace. That is as plain as I can state it. I cannot make it any plainer than that. But we see a disposition now to depart from the simplicity of the gospel as it was preached by the Lord Jesus Christ.

Then Mr. Wallace refers to the angel appearing to the shepherds by night, and that he brought glad tidings of salvation which should be to all people. Yes, sir. Now, were these glad tidings to Herod ? Let Mr. Wallace answer that. We learn that when the Savior was born that Herod told the wise men that he wanted to go and worship the child, but in place of going to worship the child he went and had all the children of Bethlehem ordered to be murdered in order that he might destroy the Son of God, and that was glad tidings to him. Brother Wallace made a great to-do over our system which leaves out somebody—our doctrine that the atonement of Christ does not reach the entire human family. I ask you if it does not seem reasonable that such a character as Herod, who snatched little infants from their mothers' bosoms and murdered them—does it not look reasonable, if there is not any hell, that there should be a little one fixed up for

him? I say if he proves that salvation is by works he will prove a system that the Apostles never preached.

Mr. Wallace says that he believes that salvation is by grace, but that we must work in order to receive the grace. Now, I maintain that it is not grace if he receives it by works, because when we labor for it there is a consideration involved and it makes it a debt; hence it is not grace, and he cannot deny it. The Apostle Paul says, "To him that worketh, is the reward not reckoned of grace, but of debt." This is the character that we find brought to view in the Bible; it is to these characters that have not to work. Now, it is for Mr. Wallace and Paul to decide this matter between them. He is not fighting me; he is fighting the Apostle, and if he succeeds in proving that there is a work for the sinner to do in order to salvation, he has then contradicted the Apostle and he has made Paul a liar, because Paul says if it is by works it is not of grace. Again, suppose God requires me to perform certain work in order to salvation. Is not that work, whatever it may be, necessary? It is. It is necessary to be performed, and I cannot be saved without it, and that work must be part of my salvation. Then my salvation does not depend on the Lord Jesus Christ alone. But we come up here with the plain, positive declaration of Paul again. Eph. ii. 8: "For by grace are ye saved, through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God:

"(9) Not of works, lest any man should boast." Now, this would have been the best place in the world for Paul to have put in "works" if that was what he meant. Mr. Wallace makes an effort to improve upon this language of Paul, and still insists that the Bible teaches that salvation is conditional and dependent upon works. But Paul comes up and

positively declares that it is by grace, that it is not by works. I will leave this audience to decide whether Mr. Wallace in that statement is contradicting me or Paul, or both of us. It is inconsistency and nonsense for any man in this enlightened age with this language before him to come up before an intelligent people and positively declare that Paul's language is not the truth. It is for Mr. Wallace to decide the matter with Paul if he can, and I would advise him not to run foul of me any more, but that if he must run foul of anybody to run foul of Paul, and then get up and tell us what Paul meant when he used the language I have quoted.

Now, I will turn to 1st Timothy i. 15: "This is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptation, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners, of whom I am chief." Here we have Paul saying that he was the chief of sinners. Now, if Paul was the chief of sinners, let me ask you if there was any greater sinner than Paul. If there was no greater sinner than Paul, and the Lord Jesus Christ could save him without any assistance, I want to know if he cannot save sinners in the same way to-day. What did Paul do for his salvation? Did he make a point of going up to the mourners' bench on every occasion, or at all? No; persecuting the work of God. My brother says, and has asserted with great emphasis all through this discussion, that he is going to establish his position by the Bible. I hope in the course of what he has to say he will tell us whether there is such a thing as a mourners' bench mentioned in the Bible. For my part I have never seen or heard of one. Paul says that "Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners, of whom I am chief." Does this people doubt the language of the Apostle? If Jesus Christ came into the world to save sinners, I want

brother Wallace to tell me if he did it. If he did not do it, I want him to tell me the reason why he didn't do it. If Jesus Christ did do it, I want him then to tell me what was left behind for the Missionaries to do in that great work. If it has been done, there is nothing more left to be done. Now, these are the plain declarations of God. It is according to his unalterable decree, and they are so strong that my opponent in this debate will not attempt to answer them.

There is no use of his throwing up what one of the old Baptists may have said, and reproaching the whole sect for that. I am not here to defend the utterances of any such a one; I am here to defend the doctrine of the Regular Baptists as a body. My business is to stand up in defense of the church as it is in the Lord Jesus Christ. I feel it my duty—before God I do—to defend my ancient Baptist brethren and people against the charge that they believe something that they never did believe. I feel it my duty to defend a people that has come up through the dark ages, and which suffered death, hundreds and thousands of them being put to death, and they had to resort to the dens and caves of the earth, and that were persecuted as the Apostles of old were. That believe in the divine teachings of God when Christ gave the command, “Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned.” He commanded them to go, and they went without the aid of our missionary board. My brother says he believes in the Bible plan of missions; if he will read his Bible he will see what that plan is. This is the Bible plan. Jesus Christ calls his preachers and sends them to preach everlasting salvation.

They had no missionary boards then, however, that I have heard of. But have they not gone into all the world? What does Paul mean? Paul says that the gospel has been preached to every creature which is under heaven, and the Waldenses were like the Apostles when Jesus commanded them to go. He says when ye are persecuted in one city flee to another. That was the command, and the gospel was spread in that day by persecution, and I do not deny for a moment but what brethren assisted these men that preached the everlasting gospel. I believe that they were helped, and I believe that the brethren paid the servants to preach. I believe that all God's people will do that to-day. I believe that when preachers go to preach the word the Lord will ever put it into the hearts of his people to hold up their hands for them. I never have begged for one dollar during my whole life of preaching, and I have spent one half of my time preaching the everlasting gospel of the Son of God; but I am not afraid that my brethren will let me do down and suffer for anything. I have more confidence in them than that. I do not have to have a salary made up for me and made secure before I go to preach the word of God. I firmly believe that God will provide for his preachers, for he says, "Lo, I am with you," and if we have that we need not fear. But how much of the work does God do? Let us examine again 2d Timothy i. 9, 10: "Who has saved us, and called us with an holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began:

"(10) But is now made manifest by the appearing of our Savior Jesus Christ, who hath abolished death, and hath brought life and immortality to light through the gospel."

Now, if it just read "life and immortality through the gospel," my brother might have something to go on, but life and immortality do not come from the proclamation of the gospel. Mr. Wallace has charged it on our people that we do not believe the gospel has anything to do in the salvation of sinners. If he simply refers to Christ, we admit that it does; but if he has reference to the vocal utterances of the preacher, we deny its having anything to do with the sinner's eternal salvation, for the Bible positively says that he has saved us.

Now, their idea is that the preacher must go and make the call, and when they make the call, if the sinner obeys, the Lord will save him. But I want you to notice that by the language of the Bible the saving comes before the calling. He *hath* saved us and called us with an holy calling. But Mr. Wallace's people say that it is according to our works. If that had been so, Paul should have said it; but Paul positively declares that it is not our works that save us. The Apostle says, "For we ourselves also were sometimes foolish, disobedient, deceived, serving divers lusts and pleasures, living in malice and envy, hateful and hating one another." Why are we saved? Is it because we do something good? The Apostle says not by works of righteousness which we have done, but it is according to the mercy of God. And I want to impress that upon the minds of this people to-day, that if you are saved, it is by the mercy of God and not by any work of yours. So we see here that the saving and calling of people to God, that everything necessary to salvation, is the work of God; and when he calls, it is impossible that we can refuse, absolutely impossible.

It does seem passing strange that people can come to the conclusion that God, having creative power, has created man

and placed him here on earth, and has given him equal power with himself—a power that enables him to reject the wooings of the Spirit until it takes its everlasting flight. I want the brother to tell me when the Spirit comes, how far it goes with the sinner *before* it takes its flight. Does it enter his heart, or does it go begging around trying to get in but cannot. Does it teach him anything of the Father? The Bible says, “It is written in the prophets, And they shall all be taught of God. Every man therefore that hath heard and hath learned of the Father, cometh unto me.” Now, what is Jesus going to do with them? Is he going to turn them off? O no; he will not turn one of them off. And let me tell you, sinner, if you feel like going to Jesus, I will insure that he will not turn you away.

[The Moderator announced that the speaker's time was up.]

REV. MR. WALLACE SAID:

I AM before you again better than ever, notwithstanding I am very hoarse. Now, as to what brother Hardy has said in his last speech, I do not know how often he has said that same since this discussion began. His part of this book will be filled up with what he has said about the articles of faith. That is about all he has said since he commenced. I just want to notice some few things he said. I want you to take particular notice of what I will say, and when my time is up just let me know it. He says that I said here in the first place and avowed it, that salvation was unconditional. Now, I explained that, and it is no use for me to go over that again. I know that this people know what I said, and as I remarked time and again about these things, it will all appear in the report of this discussion and will show for itself.

I know that as far as bringing man here is concerned I had nothing to do with it. I know as far as atonement is concerned I had nothing to do with it. It was promised before there was any living creature born on earth. And among other things we may speak of, I have told you time and again that we do not believe in salvation by works. Why, then, is he going on with his harangue about this? Why don't he touch the subject of the discussion? That is where he don't want to go. Has he ever been on that subject since this discussion commenced? I have shown this people that we do believe in salvation by grace and damnation by works, and I charge it on him that they preach damnation by th<sub>e</sub>

decrees of God, and he has never attempted to answer it. Now, why don't he talk on that point? But that don't settle him. He goes on with his salvation by grace, and says I am conflicting with him and Paul. I wonder which of them is the largest? I reckon he thinks he is head and shoulders above Paul. Why don't you answer what Paul said, when Paul said God would have all men to be saved? Why don't you say whether that is God's decretive will or not?

Then we have the old matter of faith and repentance. He says I acknowledge that. Of course I do. The Bible teaches it. Repentance and faith is the gift of God; but does God repent for man? I asked Mr. Hardy whether the words "repent" and "believe" were in the active or passive voice. Now, my life, my house, the earth, the rain, the sunshine, are all the gifts of God. But am I to expect to make a living out of them? Is God going to fill my barns? I know that these things are the gifts of God, but am I to sit down and do nothing in the hope that God will save me? I know that God has emphatically said repentance and faith are the gifts of God; and will God withhold it when he wants a man to repent? When we are commanded by God to do a thing, and by doing it we will be saved, does not that command imply that he means to do what he says if we obey the command? Here are two men in prison in our county jail, condemned for the crime of murder; they are under the law of damnation because of their crime. The Governor issues a proclamation and tells both of them that if they will confess their guilt they will be pardoned. Now, what is this? It is the grace of the Governor bestowed on these criminals. They have never petitioned him for it. They have no idea of his offering this mercy; it is of his own free grace. On their

trial they had both pleaded not guilty, but they are condemned by sentence of the law. When the Governor's message comes, says one, I will do it, I am guilty; the other denies that he is guilty. Then, I ask, who shuts the door of mercy, is it the Governor, or the prisoner himself? God demands repentance at the hands of the sinner, and if he receives that condition of salvation and obeys it, he is saved; if he does not he shuts the door of mercy on himself and will be damned. Jesus Christ said, "If ye believe not I am he, you shall die in your sins." This is the condemnation that light has come into the world, and men live in darkness rather than in light. This is the declaration of Jesus Christ; he tells us emphatically what is damnation.

I do not know how often I have set up these things against his arguments, and he has never answered me. I told him to throw his logic on this, and I think I have repeated it twice that we are taught in the Scriptures that the wicked are to be punished, and that God is the punisher; that if God is the punisher the punishment is just, because God is just; if the punishment is just man is guilty; if a man is guilty he could have acted otherwise; if he could have acted otherwise he was a free moral agent, and was under no law of necessity. I have asked him several times to answer that proposition.

Well, he has found a Bible plan at last, however. The Bible plan was that they are to send brother Fulkerson to Kansas to organize a church, and his brethren paid the expenses; that was missionary work, he says. Now, he says Paul says the gospel was preached in all the world, and brother Worlds winked to him. Now, I ask you, brother Worlds, will you wink to me? When Paul said to preach to all the world did he mean *all* the world?

Brother Worlds—He says the sound is gone unto all the earth. You may tell the people that.

Mr. Wallace—Then have it all the earth. I say that it don't mean all the earth as we now use it. Paul at that time, when he used that language, knew there were thousands and thousands of people that never heard the gospel, and I know if you are acquainted with history you know it too. Now, here we have this Scripture in Luke ii. 1 "And it came to pass in those days, that there went out a decree from Cæsar Augustus, that all the world should be taxed." Here he says, "All the world," the Bible says all the world. Was that the Jewish nation? Did that language cover the Jewish nation? What authority did Cæsar Augustus have over the Jews? He was a Roman governor; and this language means nothing. When Paul says "all the earth," he means the Jewish nation; there were thousands of people that the gospel had never reached, and any man familiar with the history of the world knows that to be true.

Now, my brother says that proclaiming the gospel has nothing whatever to do with the salvation of sinners. Here my brother and Paul come in conflict, for Paul says, "It pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believed." So here my brother comes in conflict with Paul. I have never said that salvation was by works alone. I have repeated that often here. Why come at the close of this discussion and take up that point again?

Now, let us have something more of this matter of the mourners' bench. I thought I had soured you on that question, but it seems not. The ancient Baptists had them when my brother Hardy and myself were together in one church. We had then glorious revivals, mourners' benches and all.

But you have repudiated them now. Well, the Methodists might as well get up and argue this question, for I suppose there are fifty persons here who are Methodists, and the Methodists have mourners' benches. And I say that if any of these Methodists were to go into the fold of my brother Hardy, every last one of them would be received. They call such things the devil's work. Now, I would not be guilty—I would be ashamed to make expressions of that kind before people, so long as I was receiving converts from them and rejoicing over them; and, as I told you, if it had not been for such converts, brother Hardy's denomination would be dead to-day, but these people will not give credit to whom credit is due.

I remarked that Jesus Christ was a model missionary, and my brother has never undertaken to refute that assertion. I told you he had gone into foreign countries as these people have never done; they have never left their own country to preach the gospel to their fellow-men. The command is to *all* the Church, Go into *all* the world and preach the gospel to every creature, for all power have I given to you. But, say the Old Baptists, I won't go because the power was given to Christ. They refuse to march to the orders of Jesus Christ, and they stand still against the marching orders of the great head of the church, and they cannot deny it. And not only did Christ make the church a great missionary body, but the Apostles acted on the same principle.

I turn to Acts xi. 22: "Then tidings of these things came unto the ears of the church which was in Jerusalem; and they sent forth Barnabas, that he should go as far as Antioch." That was a heathen nation three hundred miles distant from Jerusalem. Here were missionaries sent there

by the Apostles by the orders of Christ. "Who, when he came, and had seen the grace of God, was glad, and exhorted them all, that with purpose of heart they would cleave unto the Lord."

Now, we have in Acts xiii. 1: "Now there were in the church that was at Antioch certain prophets and teachers: as Barnabas, and Simeon that was called Niger, and Lucius of Cyrene, and Manaen, which had been brought up with Herod the tetrarch, and Saul.

"(2) As they ministered to the Lord, and fasted, the Holy Ghost said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul, for the work whereunto I have called them.

"(3) And when they had fasted and prayed, and laid their hands on them, they sent them away." That is, the church sent them. "So they being sent forth by the Holy Ghost, departed unto Seleucia; and from thence they sailed to Cyprus.

"(5) And when they were at Salamis, they preached the word of God in the synagogues of the Jews. And they had also John to their minister.

"(6) And when they had gone through the isle unto Paphos,"—which was two hundred miles more—"they found a certain sorcerer, a false prophet, a Jew, whose name was Bar-jesus:

"(7) Which was the deputy of the county, Sergius Paulus, a prudent man; who called for Barnabas and Saul, and desired to hear the word of God.

"(8) But Elymas the sorcerer (for so is his name by interpretation) withstood them, seeking to turn the deputy from the faith.

“(9) Then Saul, (who also is called Paul) filled with the Holy Ghost, set his eyes on him,

“(10) And said, O full of all subtilty, and all mischief, thou child of the devil, thou enemy of all righteousness, wilt thou not cease to pervert the right ways of the Lord?

“(11) And now, behold, the hand of the Lord is upon thee, and thou shalt be blind, not seeing the sun for a season. And immediately there fell on him a mist and a darkness; and he went about seeking some to lead him by the hand.

“(12) Then the deputy, when he saw what was done, believed, being astonished at the doctrine of the Lord.

“(13) Now when Paul and his company loosed from Paphos, they came to Perga in Pamphylia: and John departing from them, returned to Jerusalem.

“(14) But when they departed from Perga, they came to Antioch in Pisidia, and went into the synagogue on the sabbath day, and sat down.

“(15) And after the reading of the law and the prophets, the rulers of the synagogue sent unto them, saying, Ye men and brethren, if ye have any word of exhortation for the people, say on.

“(16) Then Paul stood up, and beckoning with his hand, said, Men of Israel, and ye that fear God, give audience.

“(17) The God of this people Israel chose our fathers, and exalted the people when they dwelt as strangers in the land of Egypt, and with a high arm brought he them out of it.

“(18) And about the time of forty years suffered he their manners in the wilderness.

“(19) And when he had destroyed seven nations in the land of Canaan, he divided their land to them by lot.”

Then he destroyed them on account of their sins and in-

iniquities. Here we find that the Apostles went from one heathen city to another, to the distance of twelve hundred miles, and when they returned to the church to make their report there was great rejoicing on account of their success in preaching the gospel to the heathen nations. Has Mr. Hardy and his people ever preached the gospel to the heathen nations? I say that they never had a missionary of any kind. They are opposed to missionaries being sent under the marching orders of high heaven, and the great head of the church. Here we find a missionary body of the Apostles, chosen by the churches to travel and preach the gospel unto these heathen nations; and we learn on one occasion, when Paul went out as a missionary and traveled to several places, he went to Philippi and held there a great protracted meeting. But these Antimission Baptists cannot stand that sort of thing, they cannot stand a three days protracted meeting. But they used to stand it when they were with us, and when we had mourners' benches, and when we rejoiced in the conversion of a sinner, and when we had no such cold preaching as they have now. They hate all these things because they appeal direct to the heart. Jesus Christ says, How can I escape damnation, how can I escape hell? He appeals to them, and calls them a generation of vipers, meaning devils, they were such great sinners. How can I escape the damnation of hell? That is the way Christ talked to the people, and he demanded of them repentance before he would administer baptism. John said, Repent and believe. Jesus Christ said the very same thing. And we find while Paul was at Philippi, holding protracted meetings, there was a woman Lydia there, and God bent her heart to attend to the things spoken of by Paul; and while she was there I will show you where

there were mourners' benches before I get through. They tried to keep her from salvation, but she said these men are the servants of the most high God, which show the way of salvation, just as these Antimissionaries scoff at the mourners' bench, and try all the means in their power to keep men from this means of salvation, and call it the devil's work. I tell you that Paul was a missionary man, and I tell you God has commanded us to preach the gospel to all creatures. Now, I think after these Antimissionaries have received this material from the Bible about protracted meetings, and having heaped their vituperations on the Missionaries, I think they ought to shut up. I tell you if I were they I would quit such talk as they have been making, as God is my judge. When God's divine Spirit works among the people there will be Missionary Baptists. If God's divine Spirit accompanies his word there will be results. God can use his means to bring a sinner to salvation. God can use anything; strong means, weak means, or any means at all. We cannot limit the power of God; it will reach man anywhere and under all circumstances, wherever his lot may be cast. He may be in prison, or he may be at the altar of prayer; he may be under the gallows and about to be executed, and the power of God may reach him.

[The Moderator announced that the speaker's time was up, and the debate was thereupon adjourned until the afternoon.]

### ELDER HARDY SAID:

[Pursuant to the adjournment, the debate was continued in the afternoon. The rules governing the discussion were read by the Moderator.]

GENTLEMEN Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: I am before you now for the purpose of speaking my last half hour in which I will be permitted to bring in any new testimony. But before proceeding with the legitimate line of my argument, I desire to notice some statements that my brother made in his last speech. He claims that he asked me questions several times in regard to free moral agency; and among other things he quotes a proposition which I will read, in order that I may the better answer him. "If man is to be punished in the world to come, God must be the punisher; if God be the punisher, the punishment must be just; if the punishment be just, the punished must be guilty; if the punished be guilty, they could have done otherwise." He says that they could have done otherwise, and that consequently this proves the doctrine of free moral agency. Now, I say they could not have done otherwise, and if I don't prove that assertion, then let it fall.

The Bible says that "The Lord hath made all things for himself; yea, even the wicked for the day of evil." And the Lord says again (Daniel xii. 10), "But the wicked shall do wickedly: and none of the wicked shall understand; but the wise shall understand." The Bible says especially that there are characters that cannot understand. The Bible says that they are all in a natural state, and that they have no fear of

God before their eyes. The Bible says that there is none that understands, and none that seeketh after God. Now, Mr. Wallace admits here that everything we enjoy is the gift of God. So do I say the same thing. I agree with him that the clothes we wear and the water we drink and the fire that gives us warmth are all the gifts of God. But I want you to notice another thing. Sometimes they will come up and argue in this way, and say that these Old Baptists sit down on a stool and do nothing. Suppose, he says, you sit down on a stool and do nothing; when the time comes round for you to plant your crop and seed for the harvest, will you sit down and do nothing? How much will you reap if you sit down on a stool and do nothing? Now, that is a beautiful argument. Now, suppose brother Worlds and myself were to undertake to make a crop, and we go out and plow, and make all necessary arrangements to get our ground all ready for planting, and when we come to look around we find we have not got a grain of corn in the world. What would we do? We would turn in and get a few grains. But let me tell you, that corn is the gift of God, as everything else is; and when God sends us the grain and the soil we can cultivate it, but not until then. And so it is with the Spirit of God; when he sends it to us we can cultivate it, and there will be a great increase.

Then my brother comes up with his quotation of "all men" and "all the world." Now, that is the charge laid against us, that we believe that that word "all" really means a part, and he acknowledges himself that the word "all" as used there does not mean everything. Now, that is the charge made against us in the *Paducah News*, after our former discussion. It said that Mr. Hardy took the position that Christ

did not die for all men. Of course I know that the words "every man" and "all men," and such expressions as these, do not every time mean everything; so when we come to the expression, "all the world," it does not mean everything. The "whole world," as used in the Bible, does not really mean the entire world. That is what we have ever contended for. But the Apostle says that they went forth and preached everywhere. Now, he meant something by that, and let the Bible mean as much for us as it does for them.

And then he tells us that by the foolishness of preaching it pleased God to save them that believe. Again, that is what we have always contended for, that God will save those that believe. I will read now from 1st Corinthians i. 21: "For after that in the wisdom of God the world by wisdom knew not God, it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe.

"(22) For the Jews require a sign, and the Greeks seek after wisdom:

"(23) But we preach Christ crucified, unto the Jews a stumbling-block, and unto the Greeks foolishness;

"(24) But unto them which are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God and the wisdom of God."

Now, what do they get out of this quotation? The Apostle here says that we preached Christ and him crucified, to the Jews a stumbling-block, and unto the Greeks foolishness. He is now talking to the Jews and Greeks, and he says that the preaching of the gospel to these Greeks is foolishness, and a stumbling-block before them. But it seems there is another character brought to view here. There is the Greeks and the Jews, and it seems they are called; he called them. If the preachers called them, what is the foolishness in

preaching to them? If it was their business to call these people, why didn't they answer? It is the Lord that the Apostle says saved us and called us. He here refers to the Jews and Greeks that they were preached to, and on the day of Pentecost, when the Apostles stood up and preached that the people cried out, "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" The Apostle replied, "Repent, and be baptized, every one of you." What made these people cry out? Notice a little further. The Apostle says that the promise is unto you. The Apostle knew, because these people had cried out and showed that they had wisdom about these things, and consequently he could say, "The promise is unto you." The people, crying out, made it manifest that they were living children. You never heard a dead child cry. They were living children; and if there were living persons here, and were to ask to-day, "What must I do to be saved?" it would be manifest that they were enlightened by the Holy Spirit. Then the Apostle goes on to say, "For the promise is unto you, and your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call." But I want you to notice the point, "It pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe." Suppose it had read thus, "It pleased God to save the unbeliever;" what would we have said that meant? Of course that it pleased him to save the unbeliever. But it does not say that. It says that it pleased God to save those that *believe*. He is talking, you observe, to the believer, and it is the believer under consideration here. But the wonder is how it is that the believer can be saved? Did not the Apostle Paul, when he was ad-

monishing his son Timothy, say, "Take heed unto thyself, and unto the doctrine; continue in them: for in doing this thou shalt both save thyself and them that hear thee?" And this individual was a gospel preacher at the time Paul was admonishing him. "Save yourself;" how? By taking heed unto yourself, and to the doctrine contained in this book, and avoiding the delusions and false systems in the world, and you will also save others if they follow you. Now, it seems a hard matter for people to discern between eternal salvation and this salvation spoken of here.

I have now attended to two of Mr. Wallace's quotations. I will now proceed with my argument.

In John vi. 44, Jesus says,—and I want you to pay particular attention to it—that "no man can come to me, except the Father which hath sent me draw him." Now, with that in view, I would ask if there is any way by which a man can come to Jesus except he be drawn by the Father. If there is, why did Jesus use the above language? O, but, says one, we believe that too. We believe that there must be a drawing; that the Father is drawing at every sinner, trying to draw them to him. But Jesus says, "All that the Father giveth me *shall come to me.*" Here we see that Jesus uses the word "shall," and has not left it discretionary with the sinner. The sinner has no will to come until he is made willing by the Spirit. We take the position that God does not draw the sinner against his will, for he says, "My people shall be willing in the day of thy power." He gives them power and then they come. And notice here we find that he says he found Jacob in the wilderness, and he found his people where he found Jacob, in the wilderness of sin; and let

me tell you, the Lord Jesus Christ does not require you to come up and meet him on any half-way ground; every sinner in the world would go to hell if that were the case. It would be impossible; they cannot come half-way to meet him. And that is our doctrine. These Missionaries still think, as my brother's argument would seem to show, that God requires man while in a helpless condition to act in order to get life; while we believe that a man cannot act unless he has life. Now, I am not talking about natural life, but about spiritual life. We have natural lives and can think of natural things, but we cannot act in a capacity in which we do not live. That is impossible. But when we are capacitated, I take the position that that may be done by the power of God. When we are capacitated to understand spiritual things and to worship God in a spiritual capacity, then we can do it, and it is our duty and God requires it of us. But God does not require any impossibilities of man. Now, the plan I understand them to have is that sinners go to hell. This is what God has against them. He requires them to do certain work; he requires them to meet him half-way; they won't do it, and consequently they are sent to hell, yet they tell us he loves them mighty well. He loves them so well that he sent Christ into the world to die for their sins. Now, I have asked him the question, I believe, once or twice, which characters will go to hell. He admitted that a portion of the human race goes there, and I admit the same thing; but these characters that go to hell—I asked him the question, Did God purpose to save these characters that do go to hell, or did he try to save them? I don't know whether he ever did or not; but I am inclined to believe that whatever

God tries to do he succeeds in. We are told that God spake and it was done. He don't make any inquiry whether I can do this, that, or the other, but he says let him do thus and so, and the work is done according to his divine purpose. That is my belief.

Well, I believe he has given up that he cannot find the mourners' bench in the Bible. He says that when a man mourns on the ground that is a mourners' bench; a pretty extensive mourners' bench, to be sure. But on that subject it seems to me that everything has been said that is necessary on my part, and I believe I will stop on that branch of the subject.

I want to remark further that it has been charged upon us, and the impression has gone out on the minds of this people, that the Old Baptists were drunkards, that the Old Baptists had persons in their communion that were drunkards, and that it was a common thing. I think every Old Baptist in this portion of the country knows that that is not true, and the statement that we turned out of our church Old Baptists for giving a dollar for benevolent institutions, or paying a dollar for the support of little orphans, is equally untrue. I tell you before God that I would pay a dollar or more at any time for such a purpose, and I don't believe that there is an Old Baptist here that would hesitate to contribute to the support of a fatherless child. It is an accusation that is wholly and entirely false, and it is just such denunciations as these that have given rise to the idea which prevails now that the Old Baptists are so selfish, that the Old Baptists don't care for anybody but themselves. Now, I have just this much to say, the Old Baptists are not perfect in everything, but as

far as these things I have mentioned are concerned, I believe they are as good and would aid in such things as quick as any person under heaven. But what we object to is such matters of general association, where one may take a seat for one dollar, and may purchase a life membership for thirty dollars. That is something that cannot be denied here. My brother attempts to get out of it by saying that it is not an individual matter, but an association of churches. If that were true it would probably have been stated in the circular that I have referred to, and I take the liberty of denying that it is so. Read what Belcher says on page 984, "Only six millions of dollars are spent annually to keep six thousand missionaries in the United States," while we are told in the circular I have referred to that it cost ninety-five millions of dollars annually. Don't you see what a tremendous amount of money it takes to support this kind of religion? Jesus says, "Upon this rock I will build my church;" and let me tell you, this church that Jesus built is not of the world; it don't take the wealth of the world to support it, but Jesus does it by his own power, and I thank God that Jesus rules and reigns, and I thank God that my eternal salvation depends upon Jesus Christ, and upon Jesus Christ alone. And let me tell you here before God whom I look to, take Jesus from me and you have left me nothing, but give me him and I have everything. The wealth of the world is nothing as far as that is concerned, and yet they say I am opposed to missionaries. I only desire to proclaim the truth of Christ, and you can call me what you like. I have never been sent to preach by missionary support, and I may state here that one-half of my entire time is devoted to preaching the gospel to

the people. And I tell you if you depend on your works for salvation, you will find when the time comes that it will not do; when it comes to death you will have to trust to Jesus alone. These people of Mr. Wallace have everything conditional except resurrection, and they would have that conditional if they could make it.

And there is another remark I wish to make—I have the paper here to prove it—that there are some members of the Missionary Baptists that are now in favor of taxing the members.

[The Moderator interrupted the speaker, as his time was up.]

---

#### REV. MR. WALLACE SAID:

GENTLEMEN Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: I am before you again. Brother Hardy got on to my logic this time; he is getting along very well now. Brother Worlds ought to have been here since the beginning of this discussion to post him up. Why, brother Worlds, you never heard such stuff as brother Hardy has been getting off here in your absence. You have just come too late, but this thing is all to be published, and it will show what he has been doing. I would advise you to read it carefully.

Well, well, preaching to the believer to save the believer, he says. By the foolishness of preaching it pleased God to save the believer. You preach to the believer to save the

believer. That has been your logic in this discussion. Brother Worlds, you should take him out and drill him again. Such logic as that is too thin to pay any attention to. Now, you have preached that the sinner is not the subject of gospel address, and consequently they preach to the believer to save the believer. That is their doctrine in this country. We have it here in Coffey. The individual must be quickened by the divine Spirit of God before he is the subject of gospel address. That is what they preach, consequently they never preach to the sinner, though he has denied it time and again since this discussion came up. "No man can come to me except the Father draw him." I quoted that language before you did; don't you take the other side now. I did not tell you that a man could come to God without the Father drawing him. I have set that up time and again. I have spoken of this often enough, so far as that is concerned, that no man can come to the Son except God the Father draw him. God has ordained his means to draw him, and consequently the Spirit of the living God accompanies the preaching of the gospel, and by that influence the sinner is drawn to Christ. And while this is true, the divine being said, "Ye will not come to me that you might have life." Does not that indicate that the sinner might come to God and have life? But what is the use of going over these things again? I have had to retail them time and time again, and I think I have impressed this argument on the minds of this people.

"My people shall be a willing people in the day of thy power," quotes Mr. Hardy. That is just what I say; but God has ordained his means in the day of his power, and God sent forth missionary preachers for the same purpose, accom-

panied by the divine Spirit to make them willing. If man would come to God of his own accord, there would be no use of the gospel; of Christ there would not. Now, according to your own doctrine, if you carry it out right, man can be brought to conversion if he was quarreling with his wife, or committing murder, providing he was one of the elect. That is your doctrine that you have preached in this country, that salvation is without works.

During this discussion I called on Mr. Hardy to tell us something about damnation. He has had a great deal to say about grace. Have not I heard it time and again that they preach damnation by the decrees of God, and have I not charged him with preaching that? Why don't he answer that?

Well, he says there is not an individual in hell that God ever loved. Well, I don't know about that; I have never been down there, and that is not all; if I can help it I don't intend to go there. But I learned of one young man who came to Christ to know what he must do to be saved, and he pleaded self-righteousness, that he had done all the things that were required. That was the besetting sin of his; Christ knew his heart, and he told him he had not done them. I tell you what you must do to have eternal life, sell all you have and give it to the poor. Christ saw his covetousness, and the young man went away in his sin, and Christ loved him as he loved all other sinners, just in the same degree.

Then he complains of my charge against them about their not turning people out of their church for whiskey drinking. Ah! that hurts them. They could not stand that. They deny it now, and claim that they never turned anybody out for giving money to charitable institutions. Well, if you are

not convinced that it is proved when the report of this discussion comes out, you can accuse me of saying what is not true. And it is of no use telling that again here, for I have proved they have done it.

And here he comes again with his "Money! money! money!" But, he says, these Missionaries are giving away their money. Well, it is not your money, and I reckon we have a right to do with our own money as we please. You never gave a dollar in your life, and you have no business to complain of what we do with money that don't belong to you. I don't see why you ought to be worried over that. It don't concern you in the least. Have not I a right to give my money to any institution, any charitable institution that I see fit? Brother Worlds says, "Away with them—away with your Bible societies!" Now, I have set up the objects of the Bible society. It is well known what its objects are, and it is of no use fooling away time any longer on that point. I just merely called your attention to it. But I suppose all this is done in order to call my attention away from the Bible, but I propose to resume it. "I say therefore unto you that you will die in your sins; if you believe not I am he, you shall die in your sins." I have told this people that nothing in the world shall damn them but unbelief, not the decrees of God; I have proved that. And I don't think there is any use of going over that again. John iii. 18: "He that believeth on him is not condemned; but he that believeth not is condemned already," because God decreed it. He wants us to read it right; that is a very good way to read it. Here is the very reason set up of the cause of damnation—"Because he hath not believed"—and this is damnation. Did God decree it from eternity? Observe the lan-

guage, "Because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God." This is the reason to-day that condemnation rests on the human family. I asked my brother to answer the question, What is condemnation? Is it the decree of God to finally condemn? Has he answered that? I say he has not. I will answer it. If such had been the case, all the human family would have gone down to condemnation, because they are all under the decree of condemnation. Now, if it had been his decree to finally condemn, no mortal man could have been saved. Brother Worlds knows that this is so if he would but acknowledge it. Now I will turn from this.

I have something more to say about missionary operations, and as I have come to this, I wish to continue this subject. Now, while Paul was pressing the brethren at Rome, he uses this language: "I am debtor both to Greeks, and to the barbarians; both to the wise, and to the unwise." Observe, he says to the wise and to the unwise. The barbarians were the heathen, and you know the Greeks were the philosophers of the day; and he was under obligations to preach the gospel to all of them. Then he says, "So, as much as in me is, I am ready to preach the gospel to you that are at Rome also. For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ; for it is the power of God unto salvation." I told you that the old prophet said that in the day of his power would he make his people willing. Now, here is the day of his power when he ordains the preachers to preach the gospel to the people. It is the divine ordaining of God—Jesus Christ has ordained it—it is the ordinance of salvation that God himself has declared from his eternal throne, and he will carry it out; and there is a people that has preached the gospel to every

one as Jesus ordained it, and the power was given him from heaven, and he could have ordered the church to march onward, and when that church refuses to do it, she is rebelling against the marching orders of high heaven. This is the power to every one that believeth the glad tidings, and this is great joy that Christ has brought to us, for he is the author of it. He was the missionary to this land; he brought his own gospel here that we might have access to the throne of grace. Not only that, but it was anciently so. I don't believe that there was any life in the old Scriptures—I don't believe it. Jesus has always been in the world. Not only was he manifest in the flesh, but he has been here since man's fall, looking forward to the atonement that God should make for suffering humanity. Christ has ever been in the world, and consequently there were nations that looked forward to that time. Everything centers in Jesus, and all men look forward to the atonement; and Christ ordained his own gospel to bring in the elect of God, those that were elected before the foundation of the world. God ordains his own means. How does he tell you that we shall preach salvation? By our works, and by the mediation of the Son of God, by the atonement that has been made for sinners. As I have told you before, you cannot release yourself any more than the man in prison; you must be released. It is by the grace of God to the human family. Before they were brought into existence God could look through the vista of time and see all things accomplished. He could look and see what men would do. He saw that man would fall, and he saw that they could not take themselves from the curse of the law. It was a perfect law, and nobody but a perfect being could fill it. And when we fell under the curse of the law

Jesus made the atoning sacrifice. None but him could have done it, and the ordinance of high heaven was to preach the gospel to every creature. Paul says, "I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ, for it is the power of God to every one that believeth, to the Jew as also to the Greek."

I hope, my friends, you will be patient with me, for I am very hoarse. We will have some mourners here before we leave. I have some mourners' benches here now, and I have some Old Baptist mourners here, and some of them are on the ground, but I reckon they will not fall off that mourners' bench.

Now, says Paul, "For therein is the righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith; as it is written, the just shall live by faith."

"For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness, and unrighteousness of men, who hold the truth in unrighteousness."

"Because that which may be known of God, is manifest in them; for God hath shewed it unto them."

"For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse." Now, I tell you that the sinner will never come up and plead that he had not a chance for salvation. He cannot come up and say, "God, why did you send me to hell?" He will not do that. It is one of the unalterable decrees of God that he gave to every man a chance for his life. Now, listen to what follows: "Because that, when they knew God, they glorified him not as God." That is the way of the sinner exactly. There is not an ungodly man before me that does not know it. "Neither were thankful,

but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened.

“Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools:

“And changed the glory of the uncorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and four-footed beasts, and creeping things.

“Wherefore God also gave them up to uncleanness, through the lusts of their hearts, to dishonor their own bodies between themselves:

“Who changed the truth of God into a lie.” Who did this? The very sinners. And for this reason God gave them up to uncleanness, and for no other reason was it done.

“And worshiped and served the creature more than the Creator, who is blessed forever. Amen.”

“For this cause God gave them up to vile affections. For even their women did change the natural use into that which is against nature:

“And likewise the men, leaving the natural use of the woman, burned in their lust one toward another; men with men working that which is unseemly, and receiving in themselves that recompense of their error which was meet.

“And even as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, God gave them over to a reprobate mind.”

They did not like to retain the knowledge of God in their minds, and God gave them over to a reprobate mind.

Here the Apostle denounces them for faults and crimes just as sinners are guilty of at the present day. The sinner does not like to be in the company of christian men. Hell has a harsh sound in their ears. They do not like the name of the devil; they do not like the name of eternity. These words have a harsh sound in their ears. They do not like to

contemplate it. They put it as far away from them as they can. They know there is a God that made all things. They know there is a God that has promised rewards and punishments; and God punishes those who disobey his laws, and rewards those who obey it. And they know that every promise of God must be accomplished and fulfilled. And I tell you, if any of you are lost to-day it is because you retain not the knowledge of God in your minds; you are an immoral being, and you must die, and at the last day your spirits will be ushered into the divine presence of God, whether you are prepared or unprepared. And therefore, says the Apostle, "How shall we escape if we neglect so great salvation?" And so far as the atonement is concerned, I know that the sinner had nothing to do with it. That is what I told brother Hardy; as far as the unconditional theory is concerned, I know the atonement was made in the divine mind long before any moral being was made; and in this sense it must be unconditional. But God requires faith in the atoning blood of his Son. And I know that faith implies repentance, and whenever it is asked, "Do you believe in the Lord Jesus Christ?" that implies repentance. The sinners say these things; they believe in the reality of the religion of the Lord Jesus Christ, they believe in a God, they believe in eternity, they believe they will die, but they go on regardless of these things; nevertheless, you cannot find a man in the world that intends to go to hell. You may talk about these things to him, and he tells you that he would be religious if God would put it in his power, when the truth is he does not like to retain the knowledge of God in his mind. He does not seek him. He wants to steer clear of him. And I know then that he cannot come of his own accord.

We have gone so far in our sins that we cannot return of our own accord. It is necessary for Jesus to bring us, and this atonement was made for the sinner, and he comes to God and seeks his favor.

Why, I believe I would get all of these Old Baptists into the church in a short time if I had time enough. They left our church forty-eight years ago, and they have been out of it ever since.

[The Moderator announced that the speaker's time had expired.]

---

#### ELDER HARDY SAID:

GENTLEMEN Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: The brother has asked me several times in regard to damnation. He wants me to tell him something about damnation. Now, I will answer that in this way, that Jesus Christ never called on me or sent me out to preach damnation, but to preach him and him crucified. Mr. Wallace turned to me and said that I never gave a dollar in my life for missionary purposes, or anything of that sort. Now, how does he know that? I know that I have, and I think I ought to best know what I have done.

Mr. Wallace—Then what do you oppose it for?

Mr. Hardy—Then he comes out in his last speech with the quotation, "What must we do to be saved?" I have been long listening here to know what he says the sinner has to do to be saved, but he has failed to tell us until his last speech. I am glad that he came out at last and told us what

we had to do. He refers to the young man that came to Christ and asked the question, "What must I do to be saved?" Why, Jesus told him, and the young man replied, "All these have I observed from my youth," and he wanted to know what he yet lacked. Jesus said, "Go sell all that thou hast and give it to the poor, and thou shalt have a treasure in heaven." Now, that is what Jesus said was the requisite to salvation—to sell all that we have and give it to the poor. Right here I want to know if my brother Wallace has ever done that. If that is the plan of salvation, I want to know how you are to get to heaven unless you comply with that requirement? Now, if there is no objection, I would like to make a quotation that I have so far omitted in reply to what my brother has said. He has already quoted a portion of it in his last speech, and if the Moderators will permit it I will also refer to and quote from it.

[The Moderators decided that according to the rules it would be improper to allow the speaker to make the quotation.]

Elder Hardy—Very well. It is not my purpose to stand before this congregation half an hour. This is my last half hour in this debate, and then the discussion will be left to the public, to read and decide for themselves. They will then know what I have said and what Mr. Wallace has said. It is not worth while for me to recapitulate what he has done, or to state what he has not done. Neither is it worth while for me to say what I have done or what I have failed to do. As I have said, the people will have an opportunity of reading and judging for themselves. I want to remark here that I am glad that this discussion has gone off in peace and quiet, and that the people who are sitting here to-day are

sitting in harmony and peace. Now, so far as I am concerned, I desire to say that I have nothing at all against the Missionary Baptists individually, so far as they themselves are concerned. They know I do not believe their doctrine, but I know and believe that there are many good Missionary Baptists that I esteem as highly as any people in the world, and I believe that some of them are good christian men; men that would favor me just as quick as any person under heaven would, and just as readily as they would favor anybody else. True, we are divided in regard to religious matters, but that does not prevent me from saying that they are as good neighbors and as conscientious men as could be desired. Nevertheless, when I come to defend the cause of my heavenly Master I want it distinctly understood that I have no compromise to make with any person under heaven. I stand right up for what I believe to be the truth in Christ.

I have but a few more remarks to make, and then this discussion will close, so far as I am concerned. I want to tell this people that I have no idea we will ever meet again on this side of eternity. I know my nature is such that if I had the power I would save every sinner under God Almighty's sun; but I have not the power, and consequently I must tell these people that Jesus Christ is the only Savior that can save the poor, lost, dying sinners. And if we are permitted to enter into the paradise of God, let me tell you it will be on the doctrine that I have preached unto you through this discussion—salvation by grace alone and none other. Now, I want to bid these people a last farewell. I hope to meet them all up yonder in the better world. So far as this discussion is concerned, I will repeat what has been said on

several occasions already, that it will be published in book form, and that the pages will go out to the world for its judgment between us; and after I am dead and gone, many of the people here will be left to read them, and my voice will be heard through these pages, though I am no more on earth. I want the people to know that it was the last word I spoke here, that my dependence is placed wholly in the Lord Jesus Christ, and if I am ever permitted to enter into the paradise of God, I know that it is not by anything I have done—not by anything I ever can do—but it is by the power and by the grace of God alone. And that is the only system I know of; that is the one thing that will reach the case of the human family in every condition. I believe that every character here to-day that will be permitted to enter the paradise of God will go there by this power, and by none other. Depend on the Lord Jesus Christ; it is his word, and his word alone; take the word of God alone. Try to do everything that Jesus has commanded, and then I hope we will be permitted to live up yonder in the paradise of God, and there to dwell in the favor of God, and join the angels in the world above in singing the praises of the great almighty God. And unto that great name be glory and dominion for ever and ever. Amen.

REV. MR. WALLACE SAID:

GENTLEMEN Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: Why, the brother hardly gave me time to rest. I have only a few more quotations to make, simply to enlarge on what I have already said. Of course this is regarded as a summary, but I am not going to sum up everything that has been said. I do not intend to do that from the fact that this discussion is to come out in book form. But as I was speaking of missionary operations, and I presented to you where Christ made the great church a missionary body, and in his church at Jerusalem he sent out missionaries. Now, 2d Corinthians viii. 18, you will find where the churches combined. "We have sent with him the brother, whose praise is in the gospel throughout all the churches;

"(19) And not that only, but who was also chosen of the churches to travel with us with this grace, which is administered by us to the glory of the same Lord, and declaration of your ready mind."

[It was here objected to the speaker's making any quotations, as a violation of the rules.]

Mr. Wallace maintained that he had a right to enlarge on anything that he had already presented. If it were under the matter not admitted I would have no right to do it. Brother Worlds knows something about these rules, and he ought to know.

Mr. Worlds—There is no right to enlarge at all.

Mr. Wallace—I will leave it to the Moderators.

The Moderators announced it as their opinion that such enlargement would be out of order.

Mr. Wallace—Well, then let it go. I have them anyhow, and it makes no difference really. I know they are burning under this, and I don't need to make any enlargement; I assure you of that. Now, there has been a large attendance here ever since this discussion commenced, and a deep interest has been taken in this subject by the people, and they are well aware of the fact of which is right or who has gotten the best of this discussion. I will leave it to them. The people will not forget that brother Hardy opposes Bible societies, and that while he opposes missionary operations he claims that he gives towards them. Mr. Hardy has been fighting missionary operations all the time; he says he believes in the Bible plan, but he has so far failed to present his Bible plan. I have called upon him to do it time and again. And there are numbers of the passages of Scriptures that he has not answered, and now I do not propose to stand before this people to recapitulate what has been done; I am willing to leave it to you.

But, in concluding, let me tell you Mr. Hardy's plan will never bring hope or comfort. I tell you that man makes himself a sinner; God never made man a sinner. Man is God's workmanship, and he never made anything but what was good. Man made himself a sinner; God never did. God did not make the devil, the devil made himself a devil, as man makes himself a sinner. I tell you man is responsible for himself, and let me warn you to beware of this doctrine of these Antimissionaries. O, it is a pleasing doctrine, to be sure; it stifles the conscience of the sinner. I know the time when I lived under that doctrine; when the people told me

not to mind about my salvation, that God would bring me in his own good time, that I could do nothing for myself, but must wait until God brought me. And so it is that thousands and thousands of them have gone down to their graves without the hope of eternal life. I have known thousands of them going down to their graves, leaving no evidence that they had peace in their souls, and let me tell you, my dear friends, if you are lost you will have no one to charge with it but yourself. You will come up before your God with a guilty conscience, with your heads hanging down, with your knees smiting together, and damnation written on your brow. I beseech you be warned by me for the last time that I will address you.

Let me impress on you that nothing short of repentance of your sins and faith in the atonement that God has made; the mediation of Christ; reliance on what Jesus has done; and going to him as guilty and unworthy sinners, not pleading anything you have done, but pleading the satisfaction of the crucified Redeemer, that the Son of God has come down and made atonement for you and all sinners—nothing but that will save you. You are under the law of unbelief, and so long as you remain under the law of unbelief, condemnation is written on your brow. I tell you nothing but unbelief will sink you under the curse of God. Let me warn you for the last time of your sins, and to pray to God to help you to come to him, and if you do so let me tell you he will not reject you, for it is said when the sinner comes God will abundantly pardon. Mercy is the divine attribute of God. God is a merciful God; he is a God of love. This is his divine attribute, and he is ready to administer this mercy and love to repentant sinners to-day as ever,

even to the uttermost ends of the earth; anywhere you may be. You may be in prison, you may be in heathen lands, you may be in the battle field, but wherever you may be, when you come to Christ and appeal to him he will not turn you away. Nay, he has invited you to come. He has said to the sinner, "Come to the water of life and drink freely; whosoever will may come and take of the water of life freely."

Now, before we close, I want to say this, as far as this discussion is concerned I know it has been heated at times, but so far as I am concerned it has been perfectly friendly. I know my brother Hardy has nothing in his mind of feeling against me for anything I have said, and if he has I ask his forgiveness for it here before you all. And I ask him to show this people that we can part after this debate in peace and love as christians, notwithstanding we have been fighting one another for five days. Let us show to all the world that we can lay down our prejudices and embrace each other in brotherly love. And while I ask my brother to shake hands with me now, I will ask of the brethren to sing that beautiful and glorious song, "Amazing grace, how sweet the sound."

[The congregation sang the hymn, "Amazing grace, how sweet the sound," accompanied with a general hand-shaking and congratulation, and then dispersed.]

---

I HEREBY certify that the foregoing is a full, true and correct transcript of the debate that took place at the time stated therein, between the Rev. Mr. Wallace, representing what are known as the Missionary Baptists, and Elder Hardy, representing what are known as the Old Baptists, at Mount Moriah, in the County of Livingston, State of Kentucky; and I further certify that neither party to the debate, nor any one interested in it, has seen or examined this transcript before it went into the hands of the publisher.

SIMEON MCPHERSON, Stenographer.

## E R R A T A .

- Page 11, line 1 from top, for *to any other race of men*, read *entire race of men*.
- Page 12, line 16 from top, for *that he has redeemed every nation, kindred and tongue*, read *that he has redeemed us to God by thy blood out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation*.
- Page 17, line 10 from top, for *do*, read *do not*.
- Page 18, lines 3 and 5 from bottom, for *prove*, read *disprove*.
- Page 42, reject history from the word *part* in line 5 from top, to the word *Novatian* in line 6 from bottom of page 43.
- Page 46, line 5 from top, for "1680," read "1806."
- Page 46, line 9 from bottom, for "200," read "204."
- Page 47, line 4 from top, for "886," read "186."
- Page 55, line 16 from top, for *might*, read *might not*.
- Page 65, line 2 from bottom, for *give the honest*, read *apply the wrong*.
- Page 76, line 8 from top, for "1854," read "1824."
- Page 76, line 3 from bottom, for *Spirit says to have*, read *the fruit of the Spirit is*.
- Page 77, line 1 from top, for *Society*, read *Society in America*.
- Page 79, line 10 from top, for *one clause*, read *fifth article*. Note.—Said article should have been inserted, but it was not. See it in Jones, page 325.
- Page 80, line 6 from bottom, for *first Baptists*, read *first Separate Baptists*.  
Reject history from the word *forever* in line 4 from bottom of page 91, to the word *day* in line 13 from bottom of page 93.
- Page 101, line 9 from top, for "1702," read "1792."
- Page 103, line 14 from bottom, for "1701," read "1707."
- Page 116, line 1 from bottom, for *brethren*, read *persons*.
- Page 120, line 14 from top, for *in the world*, read *among*.
- Page 120, line 14 from top, for *division*, read *Reformation*.
- Page 122, line 6 from bottom, for *man*, read *mar*.

Page 125, line 7 from bottom, for *America*, read *Arminian*.

Page 165, line 8 from top, for *did not*, read *did*.

Page 169, line 14 from bottom, for "1801," read "1811."

Page 192, line 11 from top, for *is*, read *is not*.

Page 206, line 14 from bottom, for *might*, read *will not*.

Page 207, line 3 from top, for *were not*, read *were*.

Page 244, line 7 from top, for *never*, read *ever*.

Page 258, line 12 from top, for *We are not so drunk as you are*, read *These*  
• *are not drunken, as ye suppose*.

Page 297, line 13 from top, for *writers knew*, read *readers know*.

Page 297, line 15 from top, for *were*, read *were not*.

Page 300, line 8 from top, for *an*, read *no*.

Page 315, line 4 from top, for *has*, read *has not*.

Page 315, line 6 from top, for *whole*, read *old*.


Page 315, line 12 from bottom, reject *and heathen*.


Page 316, line 13 from bottom, for *know*, read *give*.

---


[NOTE.—The above errors are according to copy, and due to the carelessness of the stenographer, and not to the printer.—PUBLISHER.]















LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 021 212 878 8

